

NOV 2 1942

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Volume XXXVIII NOVEMBER, 1942 Number 2

The Gracchi: An Essay in Interpretation Solomon Katz 63

Aristophanes' Influence upon Public Opinion H. Lloyd Stow 83

Notes

Thucydides and Geopolitics Henry Montgomery 93

Another Word from Lucius the Ass John L. Heller 96

Was Seneca's *Heracles* Modeled on an Earlier Latin Play? Richard M. Haywood 98

Book Reviews 102

Michell, H., *The Economics of Ancient Greece* L. R. LindGeer, Russell M., *Classical Civilization: Rome* Maurice W. AveryT. Maczi Plauti, *Epidicus* Paul Nixon

Hints for Teachers

International Day Ortha L. Wilmer 110

Games for Vocabulary Review Nellie H. Wilson 115

Current Events 118

Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals 120

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the co-operation of the Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association of the Pacific States

Editor-in-Chief and Business Manager

EUGENE TAVENNER
Washington University

Associate Editor

THOMAS S. DUNCAN
Washington University

Editor for the Pacific States

ARTHUR P. MCKINLAY
University of California at Los Angeles

Editor for New England
HERBERT NEWELL COUCH
Brown University

Associate Editors

GRACE L. BROWN
University of South Dakota

GEORGE E. LAWRENCE
Taft Academy
Brattleboro, Mass.

JOHN W. SPEETH, JR.
Wesleyan University

ALFRED P. DORYANIS
Northwestern University

G. A. HARRIS
University of North Carolina

RUSSELL M. CREECH
Tulane University

FRED L. FARLEY
College of the Pacific

FRANKLIN H. PUTTER
University of Iowa

KEVIN GUINAGH
Eastern Illinois State Teachers' College

ANGELA FERDINAND PAULS
Wesleyan University

JONES N. HOUGH
Ohio State University

Correspondence should be addressed as follows:

Concerning Manuscripts, Book Reviews, in general, as well as advertising, to Eugene Tavener, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. But manuscripts from the New England States should be sent to Herbert Newell Couch, Brown University, Providence, R.I.; from the Pacific States, to Arthur P. McKinlay, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

Concerning Special Departments, to those named at the head of each department.

Concerning Membership in the Associations:

In the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, to Norman J. DeWitt, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. For the states included in this Association, see the list of officers.

In the Classical Association of New England, to John W. Speeth, Jr., Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut.

In the Classical Association of the Pacific States, to Fred L. Farley, College of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif. The states included in this association are California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona.

Concerning Subscriptions (of those who are not members of one of the associations named above), to Norman J. DeWitt, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Concerning Missing Numbers, to Norman J. DeWitt, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and so far as the reserve stock will permit.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL is printed monthly except in July, August, and September. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 30 cents. Orders for services of less than a year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Puerto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Bolivia, Colombia, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoa Islands, Shanghai. For all other countries in the Postal Union an extra charge of 25 cents is made on annual subscriptions (total \$2.75), on single copies 5 cents (total 35 cents).

The membership fee in each of the associations named above is \$2.00 a year, with addition of 25 cents a year for Canadian members, for postage. This fee includes subscription to the JOURNAL at a special rate.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Menasha, Wis., on October 19, 1934. Additional entry as second-class matter at St. Louis, Mo., under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1102, Act of October 2, 1917, authorized on October 19, 1934.

PRINTED BY

GEORGE SANTA PUBLISHING COMPANY

MENASHA, WISCONSIN

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XXXVIII

NOVEMBER, 1942

NUMBER 2

THE GRACCHI: AN ESSAY IN INTERPRETATION

By SOLOMON KATZ
University of Washington

In his *Study of History*¹ Toynbee has some interesting remarks on the nature of scholarship which "makes its progress by a rhythmic alternation between two activities—the collection of materials and their arrangement, the finding of facts and their interpretation." The number of "facts" about the Gracchi is apparently limited. We cannot but be conscious of the hopelessness of adding anything of substantial value to our relatively meager stock of historical materials for the Gracchan age. Any account of the period must, therefore, be on the whole a rearrangement and reinterpretation of the data that have long been known. A study of the Gracchi will resolve itself essentially either into *Quellenkritik* or broad interpretation. Those who have written about the Gracchi have used substantially the same sources, but "every man" became his own historian of the Gracchi. Every man attempted his own synthesis and interpretation, each according to his sympathies and predilections.

Historical thought will, of course, take some impress from the leading institutions of the social environment in which the thinker happens to live. Our modern concern with the material things of life has quite properly led to an appreciation of their importance in the past. The historian may rashly assume, however, that some

¹ A. J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, 2nd ed.: London (1935), 1, 49.

social and economic factors were as prominent in the Gracchan period as they seem to be now. He may permit himself to be beguiled by what has been called the *nunc pro tunc* fallacy. The interpretation of the Gracchan period has sometimes gained, but sometimes also it has suffered from the historian's conscious or unconscious assumption that the values he has derived from his own position in time and in society are equally cogent for the period under discussion. In consequence, the Gracchi have been glorified as a symbol of the resistance of liberty to despotism, they have been vilified by the shibboleths of "demagogues," "socialists," "social revolutionists."² The Gracchi have been appraised as historical abstractions; they have been subjected to sweeping moral judgments in the light of modern ideologies.³ But the historian ought to examine the Gracchi in the context of Roman society rather than as eternal symbols of demagoguery on the one hand or of high-minded idealism on the other.

What have the historians said regarding the aims and the objectives of the Gracchi? They were moved by economic considerations; conversely they were impelled by political motives. Did the Gracchi see but one facet of the problem? Are the political and economic aspects of the problem mutually exclusive? The dichotomy would seem to have but little meaning. There is a nexus of factors which cannot lightly be broken. There were, in addition, certain philosophical and ethical movements, imponderable factors, which may have had some bearing on the brothers Gracchi. Admittedly the problem of motives is a difficult one; admittedly, too, there can be no final and conclusive statement of aims. The ancient sources are neither very explicit nor in harmony, and they have been variously interpreted. Yet it is possible that a survey of interpretations may suggest some solutions.

Was Tiberius moved by his teachers to take an interest in pressing social questions? This is perhaps begging the question, for we cannot be certain that the problem appeared to Tiberius as a social

² Cf. E. von Stern, "Zur Beurteilung der politischen Wirksamkeit des Tiberius und Gaius Gracchus," *Hermes* LVI (1921), 229 f.; G. Cardinali, "Capisaldi della legislazione agraria del periodo graccano," *Historia* VII (1933), 517-519; P. Terruzzi, "La legislazione agraria in Italia all' epoca dei Gracchi," *Rivista d'Italia* XXIX (1926), 668, n. 1.

³ Cf., for example, *Modern Quarterly* I (London, 1938), 211 f.

and economic one. We know that Tiberius was trained in rhetoric by Diophanes, an exile from Mitylene,⁴ and in philosophy by Blossius of Cumae, a Stoic, of the school of Antipater of Tarsus.⁵ It is possible that Tiberius was spurred to his enterprise, as Plutarch says, by the direct exhortation of these teachers, but even if Plutarch's source was exaggerated, there can be little doubt that the teaching of the two Greeks exercised some influence on Tiberius.⁶ Both Diophanes and Blossius are said still to have been his teachers when Tiberius entered upon his term of office as tribune and launched his reforms.⁷ It is possible, as Cicero implies, that the reforms of the Spartan kings, Agis and Cleomenes, suggested themselves to the young Roman statesman as patterns for him to follow. A Stoic, Sphaerus, it will be recalled, was the philosopher behind the throne of Cleomenes.⁸ Possibly Blossius followed the example of that earlier Stoic, who advised and supported reform at Sparta a century before. At all events, it is significant that, following the death of Tiberius Gracchus, Diophanes was slain,⁹ and Blossius, after being acquitted by the consuls, chose to join the rebellion of Aristonicus in Asia Minor.¹⁰ It was Aristonicus who proposed to set up a Sun State, a kingdom in which there would be equality, absence of slavery, and no distinctions of race.¹¹ Did Blossius become a revolutionary on the murder of Tiberius, and go into practical politics in the forlorn hope of attempting to translate a utopian dream into reality?¹² We have no evidence to prove it, but the hypothesis is tempting.

⁴ Plutarch, *Tiberius* 8, 5; Cicero, *Brutus* 27, 104.

⁵ Plutarch, *Tiberius* 8, 5.

⁶ Cicero *De Amic.* 11, 37; Dio xxiv, 3; Diodorus xxxiv, 5; cf. P. Fraccaro, *Studi sull'età dei Gracchi* (città di Castello, 1914), pp. 55-59.

⁷ Plutarch, *Tib.* 8, 5.

⁸ Cicero, *De Off.* II, 80, implies that the Gracchi followed the example of the Spartan kings. Cf. R. von Pöhlmann, *Geschichte der sozialen Frage und des Sozialismus in der antiken Welt* (3rd ed., Munich, 1925), I, 406; II, 373; T. Frank, *An Economic History of Rome* (2nd ed., Baltimore, 1927), p. 134, n. 6; F. M. Heichelheim, *Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Altertums* (Leyden, 1938), I, 642. For the Spartan reforms cf. Plutarch, *Agis and Cleomenes*; Pöhlmann, *op. cit.*, I, 347-392; W. W. Tarn, "The Social Question in the Third Century," in *The Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, 1923), 128-140; J. Bidez, *La cité du monde et la cité du soleil chez les Stoïciens* (Paris, 1932), 38.

⁹ Plutarch, *Tib.* 20, 3.

¹⁰ Plutarch, *Tib.* 20, 4; Cicero, *De Amic.* 11, 37; Valerius Maximus IV, 7, 1.

¹¹ Strabo XIV, 646; cf. W. W. Tarn, "Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind," *Proceedings of the British Academy* xix (1933), 130 f.

¹² Bidez, *op. cit.*, 49 f., believes that Blossius played an active rôle as propagator of

It would be naive to suppose that Tiberius was a starry-eyed visionary who was moved to his course of action by the preachings of utopians. It is likely that these teachings at least turned his attention to certain problems, but that his own observations were of profounder effect. Plutarch tells us that the need for reform was first borne in upon Gracchus when in 137 B.C., on his way to Numantia, he had passed through Etruria, a land of large estates tilled by slaves, and had noted there the dearth of free farmers.¹³ The Hannibalic war and the wars which followed in its train had had, as is well known, a profoundly disintegrating effect upon Italian social life. The peasant culture and economy, which had been the basis of Italy's social well-being in the period before the wars, was first undermined and finally swept away by the cumulative effect of a number of inimical forces:¹⁴ the devastation of southern Italy by Hannibal himself,¹⁵ the perpetual mobilization of the Italian peasantry for campaigns which carried them ever further afield for ever longer periods of continuous military service; the agrarian revolution (first accomplished in the devastated areas) which substituted large-scale farming and stock breeding with slave labor for small-scale subsistence farming by a free citizen population;¹⁶ the depopulation of the countryside and the gathering of a proletariat of former peasants in the towns.¹⁷

the revolutionary ideal; cf. Pöhlmann, *op. cit.*, I, 406. But cf. Tarn, "Alexander the Great," p. 131, n. (p. 154) 54, for a contrary opinion. D. D. Dudley, "Blossius of Cumae," *Journal of Roman Studies* XXXI (1941), 94-99, does not deny Blossius' resolute interest in reform. He believes, however, that this interest did not necessarily stem from Blossius' attachment to Stoicism, since there is little evidence that that school had any sympathy with democratic ideas. Also M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*: New York, Oxford University Press (1941), II, 808.

¹³ Plutarch, *Tib.* 8, 7, quoting from a pamphlet of Gaius Gracchus.

¹⁴ J. Kromayer, "Die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung Italiens in II. und I. Jahrhundert vor Chr.," *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* XXXIII (1914), 145-169; H. Last, "Tiberius Gracchus," *Cambridge Ancient History* IX (Cambridge, 1932), 2-10; Frank, *op. cit.*, 90-107; Frank, *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*: Baltimore (1933), I, 98-100; Heichelheim, *op. cit.*, I, 613 f.

¹⁵ Last, *op. cit.*, 4, believes that the ravages of invasion were only superficial.

¹⁶ Appian, *Bell. Civ.* I, 1, 7; Plutarch, *Tib.* 8, 1-4; cf. Livy XXXIV, 4, 9; Sallust, *Bell. Jug.* 41; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* XVIII, 6. Cf. Frank, *Econ. Survey* I, 100-102. Smaller estates, however, continued to be profitable; see Cato, *De Agri Cultura* x, xi. Cf. H. S. Jones, "Land Problems in Ancient Rome," *Edinburgh Review* CCXIV (1916), 62-65.

¹⁷ Plutarch, *Tib.* 9, 4 f.

A cogent proof of the dangers of slave cultivation was offered Tiberius, when he became tribune, by the dangerous slave insurrection in Sicily. Perhaps as many as seventy thousand slaves took up arms, and what was more alarming, they received aid from free small farmers. The Roman troops sent to crush the rebels met with disaster, and it was not until 133-132, when the fall of Numantia probably released additional troops for service in Sicily, that order was restored.¹⁸ The uprising coincided, furthermore, with the revolt of the Pergamene serfs under Aristonicus and with some minor outbreaks in Attica, Delos, southern Italy, and elsewhere.¹⁹

Appian suggests that it was with a view to combating the dangers which the system of slave labor appeared to be raising against Rome's security that Tiberius proposed his land law.²⁰ Many modern historians accept the statements of Plutarch and Appian that one of Gracchus' main concerns was to repeople Italy with a healthy peasant stock in order to increase the number of small-property owners eligible for army service.²¹ Schwartz, however, argued that it was unlikely that Tiberius, whom he regarded as a social revolutionist, would have been interested in strengthening the military power of Italy.²² Stern answered Schwartz's objections effectively by insisting that it is quite unhistorical to attribute modern anti-militaristic and revolutionary sympathies to Tiberius, who was, after all, a child of his age.²³ Schwartz's thesis has been

¹⁸ Appian 1, 9; Diodorus XXXIV-XXXV, 2, 18, 48; cf. Livy, *Epit.* LVI. The Servile War is discussed briefly by Last, *op. cit.*, 11-16. Earlier slave risings are mentioned by Livy, e.g., XXXII, 26 (Setia, 198 B.C.), XXXIII, 36 (Etruria, 196 B.C.), XXXIX, 29 (Apulia, 185 B.C.).

¹⁹ Diodorus XXXIV-XXXV, 2, 19.

²⁰ Appian 1, 9. Cf. Last, *op. cit.*, 16. M. Cary, *A History of Rome* (London, 1935), p. 294, n. 1, believes that the current tradition as expressed, e.g., in Cicero, *Brutus* 27, 103; Cicero, *De Har. Resp.* 20, 43; Velleius Paterculus II, 2; Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* VII, 4, 13, etc., that Tiberius turned demagogue because of the odium which the Numantine capitulation had brought upon him, may be set aside as part of the counter-propaganda against him.

²¹ Plutarch, *Tib.* 8, 3; Appian, 1, 9; 1, 1, 10; 1, 1, 11. Cf. F. Münzer, "Tib. Sempronius Gracchus," *P.-W.*, Zweite Reihe II, 1413-1420; T. R. Holmes, *The Roman Republic* (Oxford, 1923), 1, 15; Stern, *op. cit.*, 242 f.

²² E. Schwartz, Review of E. Meyer, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Gracchen*, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* CLVIII (1896), 802 f.

²³ Stern, *op. cit.*, 234; cf. R. v. Pöhlmann, "Zur Geschichte der Gracchen," *Sitzungsberichte. . . München* (1907), 492.

revived in modified form by Kontchalovsky, who denies that Tiberius was concerned with developing the military power of the state. Tiberius' aim was rather to preserve and to reinforce the rural class. Kontchalovsky's main argument is that Scipio Aemilianus, the real champion of Roman military interests, was opposed to Tiberius.²⁴ But Scipio's opposition was, after all, not so much to the objects as to the methods of Tiberius' legislation. Pöhlmann believes that as a social reformer Tiberius was not interested in the creation of an army as an end in itself, but rather in the amelioration of the condition of the poor. The creation of a numerous free and self-sufficient peasantry might then strengthen Rome and her army.²⁵ Last, however, thinks that Gracchus was not an agrarian reformer in the ordinary sense, that is, he was not interested in putting the land to a use financially more profitable than the present. He chose an agrarian law merely as the means to an end. The end, according to Last, was a reduction of the pauper proletariat in the towns.²⁶ In short, Tiberius' aim was rather that of a modern reformer intent on dealing with the problem of the urban unemployed, who would now have some means of livelihood. The number of substantial citizens on whom the army was supposed to draw would thereby be increased and Italy would be less subject to the dangers of large numbers of slaves.

Plutarch refers to the Gracchi as men who tried to exalt the people and to restore a just and honorable civil polity which had lapsed after a long time, and thereby incurred the hatred of the nobles.²⁷ A number of modern scholars have suggested, therefore, that the main purpose of Tiberius was to curb the vast powers of the oligarchy and thus to effect democratic reform which would reproduce at Rome something of the Periclean democracy of Athens. Rostovtzeff, for example, says that the Gracchi tried "to galvanize into life the ancient democratic institutions of Greece,"²⁸

²⁴ D. Kontchalovsky, "Recherches sur l'histoire du mouvement agraire des Gracques," *Revue historique* CLII (1926), 161-185, esp. pp. 183 f.; followed by A. Piganiol, "L'oeuvre des Gracques," *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale* 1 (1929), 382.

²⁵ Pöhlmann, *op. cit.*, 451-457; cf. also p. 484.

²⁶ Last, *op. cit.*, 9. ²⁷ Plutarch, *Agis* 2, 6.

²⁸ M. Rostovtzeff, *A History of the Ancient World* II, *Rome* (Oxford, 1927), 115.

and both Kaerst and Last believe that the two brothers derived the Hellenic ideas of popular sovereignty from their Greek teachers.²⁹

A re-examination of such evidence as we possess persuades me that Tiberius was essentially a conservative statesman who wished to rebuild the army by a system of small land grants which would at the same time curb the growing slave menace. The army was then to serve, as in the past, as an effective support of the state, and the Senate and rejuvenated people were to co-operate to form a strong and united state. What he had in mind was reform and certainly not revolution, a return to the conditions which had prevailed in *ante-bellum* days.³⁰ Plutarch says of the agrarian law:³¹ "It is thought that a law dealing with injustice and rapacity so great was never drawn up in milder and gentler terms." It is significant that an influential group of senators, the pontifex maximus Crassus, the consul Mucius Scaevola, and Appius Claudius helped Tiberius prepare the bill.³² The law itself was a model of compromise and conciliation, and it represented a traditional Roman program.

It is assuredly no indication of a desire to proclaim a new constitutional procedure that Gracchus brought his bill directly before the assembly or deposed Octavius or proposed to use the Pergamene treasure. He probably intended nothing more than to save time. His anxiety to pass the bill may have led him to ill-considered constitutional innovations,³³ but it is doubtful whether he realized the implications of his acts or could have anticipated the results in the future. He may have attacked the oligarchy, but his intentions were probably to assure the passage of the *lex agraria* rather than to destroy the Senate's control of the government. Similarly, a second tribunate may have been irregular, but in the circumstances seemed necessary.³⁴ The Senate's argument that Tiberius wished

²⁹ J. Kaerst, "Scipio Ämilianus, die Stoa, und der Prinzipat," *Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft* v (1929), 671-673; Last, *op. cit.*, 21, 28; cf. Stern, *op. cit.*, 279, 300. But cf. F. Oertel, "Die soziale Frage im Altertum," *Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft* III (1927), 9. ³⁰ Cf. Pöhlmann, *op. cit.*, 459 f. ³¹ Plutarch, *Tib.* 9, 2.

³² *Ibid.*, 9, 1; Cicero, *Acad. Prior.* II, 5, 13.

³³ Appian I, 2, 17; Plutarch, *Tib.* 16, 1, says that Tiberius planned fresh laws by which he hoped to weaken the power of the Senate. Plutarch apparently erroneously attributes certain of Gaius' laws to Tiberius. ³⁴ Plutarch, *Tib.* 16, 1.

to establish a tyranny or a monarchy may be set aside as political propaganda.³⁵ Reform may have led to revolution, but for that the Senate must bear a large share of responsibility.

Admirable though Tiberius' intentions may have been, however, the land law could not provide an adequate solution for Rome's problems. Perhaps one may say that Tiberius' very conservatism prevented any real solution, for a truly radical reformer might have attacked the problem more vigorously and possibly more effectively. As a means of checking the decline in the number of free farmers the *lex agraria* could have no more than a transient effect. No land law could keep farmers on the land as long as they were liable to be called away from their fields for prolonged periods of military service overseas. If the small holder were drafted, what would become of his farm? If his sons alone were of military age, how would the father cultivate his fields without their aid? There is little evidence that Tiberius took much interest in these fundamental aspects of the problem. Nor did he ponder the fate of the slaves, if the bill were to succeed. Were the slaves of the large land owners to be emancipated without prospect of employment? Were they to be turned loose to live by brigandage? Economic reform, which in Italy meant the revival of agriculture, was impossible without the abolition of slavery, and even if Gracchus had been able to contemplate it, men were by no means ready to accept so revolutionary a change. Tiberius apparently wished to repopulate Italy with free peasants whose small holdings would produce their livelihood. But the small self-sufficient farm belonged essentially to a more primitive and a simpler type of society. Socially undesirable though farming on a large scale might be, it was nevertheless more profitable than farming on a small scale. There was little likelihood that Tiberius' scheme could be sufficiently successful to alter materially the existing situation, still less to arrest the agricultural revolution which was taking place. Nothing, after all, was done to render the large estates unprofitable or to make the peasant proprietor better able to resist the competition of the large landowner.

As a palliative measure, however, Tiberius' proposal was ad-

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 17, 4; 19, 3; cf. Last, *op. cit.*, 34.

mirably conceived. Far from infringing on any legal vested right, the *lex agraria*, as Plutarch tells us, treated the existing occupants of *ager publicus* with noteworthy considerateness and safeguarded them against any further loss of territory.³⁶ The *possessores* might, of course, claim to have a case in equity, and they were certain to feel that their essential rights were being violated.³⁷ It was probably small consolation to them that Tiberius merely resumed, after a brief interruption, the traditional policy of land settlement.³⁸ Perhaps one may apply the statement Appian makes in another connection: "What Gracchus had in mind in proposing the measure was not money, but men."³⁹ The antithesis may be false and rhetorical, but it has the virtue of emphasizing the characteristics of idealism and practicality, which were at once the strength and the weakness of Tiberius.

A more difficult question of aims and motives is raised in the case of Gaius Gracchus. The problem is, in the absence of definitive evidence, perhaps impossible of solution, but it remains a tantalizing one, and one of more than ordinary interest. For on the answer to the question of aims depends in large measure the solution of the problem of dating the various proposals and laws of Gaius. Were the laws aiming at social reform of primary concern to Gaius, and were the political measures means to social reform, or were the social reforms temporary expedients, means to an end of political reform, an extension of democracy, and intended to be annulled or neutralized after the goal was reached? It is perhaps impossible to make any clear division here, to say that some were means and some ends in themselves. The measures actually passed formed but a fragment of his whole program, and it is difficult to set these laws in the context of that program. It is possible that social reform and political reform were regarded by Gaius as two aspects of a single problem, the solution of which he desired. Modern historians,

³⁶ So Plutarch, *Tib.* 9, 2 f.; cf. Appian 1, 9. ³⁷ So Appian 1, 1, 10.

³⁸ Earlier land distributions were in 393 B.C. (Livy v, 30, 8); 366 (Appian 1, 1, 7; Varro, *De Re Rust.* 1, 2, 9; Velleius Paterculus II, 6, 3; Livy vi, 35); 318 (Livy VIII, 11; 13 f.; IX, 20, 6); 232 (Polybius II, 21, 7); 145 (Plutarch, *Tib.* 8, 4). Cf. J. Vancura, "Leges Agrariae," *P.-W.* XII, 1150-1185; G. Cardinali, *Studi graccani* (Genoa, 1912), pp. 107-111; Frank, *Econ. Survey* 1, 26-28; F. Bozza, *La possessio dell'Ager Publicus*, 1 (Milan, 1939). ³⁹ Appian 1, 1, 11.

however, have attempted to make the distinction between means and ends, and they have frequently arranged the laws and proposals at least partly in accordance with their subjective views of his aims.⁴⁰

Some historians have argued that Gaius wished to recreate a strong peasant class, others that he wished to assert in unequivocal fashion the sovereignty of the people. Stern sees in a proper arrangement of the laws a well-conceived plan for introducing far-reaching reforms in the state. The work of both his years of office must be regarded as part of a plan—related to that of Tiberius—to assert the principle of popular sovereignty.⁴¹ From this point of view Stern sees an essential unity in Gaius' work; his laws are merely means to an end, and the end is the ideal of the Greek *polis*.

Marsh, too, believes that Gaius had a clear conception of the broad outlines of his program when he entered upon office, and that the basis for his program was his dislike of the Senate.⁴² The program was the attempt to create an anti-senatorial majority composed of the equites and certain elements among the urban proletariat. For that reason various benefits were promised to the proletariat and the equites. But the building of a political machine was not to be an end in itself; rather Gaius proposed to use it for solving the pressing problems of the day and to carry through reforms of permanent benefit to Rome.

Cary, Heitland, and Oltramare⁴³ believe that Gaius went beyond the limited objects of his brother. Cary argues that Gaius, unlike his brother, was by intent and not by accident a political reformer. Oltramare thinks that all Gaius' enterprises have a political bearing: "the weakening of the senatorial nobility by the elevation of other social groups and by a new division of rights." His social reforms are, therefore, to be regarded as expedients for the securing of political reforms. Heitland, too, believes that Gaius attempted

⁴⁰ Cf., for example, E. Kornemann, "Zur Geschichte der Gracchenzeit," *Klio*, Beiheft 1 (1903), 42–51.

⁴¹ Stern, *op. cit.*, 298–301. Cf. Holmes, *op. cit.*, I, 30; and W. E. Heitland, *The Roman Republic*: Cambridge, (1909), II, 299 f.

⁴² F. B. Marsh, *A History of the Roman World* (London, 1935), 53–67.

⁴³ Cary, *op. cit.*, 288 f.; Heitland, *op. cit.*, II, 299 f.; A. Oltramare, "Caius Gracchus," *Hommes d'état* 1 (Paris, 1936), 149, 202.

to weaken senatorial power and to restore popular sovereignty.

To Eduard Meyer the agrarian law was always Gaius' chief object and the bulk of his laws were rather a means to an end than an expression of his ultimate object.⁴⁴ Similarly, Judeich argues that Gaius was a social revolutionist whose main purpose was the completion of his brother's work, and it is on the basis of this assumption that Judeich arranges the laws of Gaius.⁴⁵

We see from this survey of representative interpretations that Gaius is regarded on the one hand as essentially a social reformer, eager to continue the reforms of his brother, on the other as a political reformer, eager to create a democracy. The suggestion made by Last does not resolve the problem, but it has the merit of effecting a compromise.⁴⁶ He would divide Gaius' tribunician career into two periods, in the first of which his attitude was far less radical than in the second. The intervention of Livius Drusus would mark the division. 123 B.C. may be regarded as the year of Gaius' moderate, and 122 as that of his more violent, reforms; in short, Gaius began as a statesman, desiring to effect necessary reforms with a minimum of friction, but was driven by his opponents to the more drastic methods of a party politician.

The problem of motives, and even of chronology, can perhaps be decided finally only in accordance with the subjective views of the historians. Gaius' laws and proposals, however, offer some objective evidence. Among the first of his laws, according to Appian, was the *lex frumentaria*.⁴⁷ This law has been regarded by some as the work of a demagogue who wished to buy votes.⁴⁸ But this

⁴⁴ E. Meyer, "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Gracchen," *Kleine Schriften* 1 (2nd ed., Halle, 1924), 390 f.

⁴⁵ W. Judeich, "Die Gesetze des Gaius Gracchus," *Historische Zeitschrift* cxi (1913), 473-494, esp. 490 f.

⁴⁶ H. Last, "Gaius Gracchus," *Cambridge Ancient History* IX (Cambridge, 1932), 49-55.

⁴⁷ Appian 1, 3, 21; cf. Plutarch, *Gaius* 5, 1; Livy, *Epit.* LX; Velleius Paterculus II, 6, etc. Several sources erroneously call it a free gift of grain at the public expense.

⁴⁸ Cf. Judeich, *op. cit.*, 481 f.; W. W. Fowler, "Notes on Gaius Gracchus," *English Historical Review* xx (1905), 221-227; Holmes, *op. cit.*, I, 24, n. 4. For the aristocratic view that this was bribery, cf. Diodorus XXXV, 25; Cicero, *De Off.* II, 72; *Pro Sest.*, 48, 103; Orosius v, 12.

charge is rather wide of the mark.⁴⁹ The corn law was not a corrupt attempt to build an anti-senatorial majority, but rather a sincere attempt to deal in a comprehensive and systematic way with a recognized and pressing problem, the problem of the hungry proletariat in Rome.⁵⁰ Gaius may have learned from his teacher, the Stoic Blossius, that the cities of the Hellenistic world had regarded it as their business to assure an adequate and cheap food supply.⁵¹ The price of grain at Rome was subject to sudden and violent fluctuations, depending upon the supply. Shortly before 123, moreover, a locust plague in Africa had probably had its effects on the market price of grain at Rome.⁵² By the provisions of Gaius' law grain was to be sold by the state at a price which would represent no serious loss. In short, this was neither a dole to the penniless, nor a vote-catching measure, but an attempt to improve the condition of those who lived in Rome. Gaius' agrarian law, his provision for new roads, his colonies, may again be regarded as genuine social reforms in harmony with Tiberius' program.⁵³

Did Gaius wish to overthrow the Senate or to weaken its control? We know that he proposed various bills which took power from the Senate and gave it to the equites. But Plutarch describes Gaius even at the height of his power as still working with the Senate, overcoming its obstinacy, and proposing measures which were honorable to it.⁵⁴ By Gaius' *lex de provinciis consularibus*, for example, an important administrative function, the right to assign provinces, was still reserved to the Senate.⁵⁵ His object was not to dispense with the Senate, but to make it a body with which he could work not to overthrow the existing constitution but to modify it to suit altered circumstances and to meet the exigent

⁴⁹ Fowler himself recognized this later; cf. his *Roman Essays and Interpretations* (Oxford, 1920), 104-107.

⁵⁰ F. B. Marsh, "In Defense of the Corn Dole," *Classical Journal* xxii (1926-1927), 10-25; Last, *op. cit.*, 55-60.

⁵¹ H. Francotte, "Le pain à bon marché et le pain gratuit dans les cités grecques," *Mélanges de droit public grec* (Liege, 1910), 291-312; M. Rostovtzeff, "Frumentum," *P.-W.*, vii, 139-143. ⁵² Livy, *Epit.* lx; Orosius v, 11.

⁵³ Plutarch, *Gaius* 5 f. Last, *op. cit.*, 68, rightly holds that the colonies were predominantly commercial, to provide for those of the unemployed who were unsuited for farming. ⁵⁴ Plutarch, *Gaius* 6. ⁵⁵ Cicero, *De Domo* 9, 24.

problems of the time.⁵⁶ From this point of view the *lex de provincia Asia* may be regarded not as an attempt to destroy the power of the Senate, but rather to augment the revenues of the state and to gain increased efficiency in administration.⁵⁷ Similarly the *lex judiciaria* may be considered as an effort to achieve a better administration of justice. Gaius was moved by a desire to effect needed reform rather than by considerations of political partisanship or a desire to destroy the Senate by building a new "machine" of proletariat and equites. The significant political effects of the *lex judiciaria* and the *lex de provincia Asia* which his critics emphasize could hardly have been contemplated or indeed foreseen by Gaius or by the Senate. The unhappy effects of these bills did not become apparent immediately.⁵⁸

Some years ago Caspari made an ingenious if unconvincing suggestion:⁵⁹ Gaius worked for the support of the equites because it was necessary to conciliate them. The opposition to the agrarian reforms of the Gracchi is usually regarded as coming solely from the ranks of the senatorial nobility. But Livy expressly states that the land law of Tiberius was no less distasteful to the equites.⁶⁰ Since only a fraction of the *ager publicus* liable to confiscation could have belonged to the very small senatorial class, perhaps the greater part was held by the equites, who had undoubtedly invested some of their profits in public land. According to Caspari, then, Gaius granted the equites substantial political privileges in his desire to buy off their opposition to his agrarian policy. The detailed arguments in support of this hypothesis are not very convincing. We have insufficient evidence to show that the equites had invested heavily in public land, few indications that they were strong enough politically to require appeasement. Gaius was more concerned with effecting political reform than with buying off a rather nebulous opposition.

Where do the laws regarding the allies fit in the plans of the

⁵⁶ Cf. W. W. Fowler, "Gaius Gracchus and the Senate," *Classical Review* x (1896), 279 f. ⁵⁷ Cf. T. Frank, *Roman Imperialism* (New York, 1914), 247-250.

⁵⁸ Cf., e.g., Appian i, 3, 22; Diodorus xxxvii, 9; Cicero, *De Leg.* iii, 9, 20.

⁵⁹ M. O. B. Caspari, "On Some Problems of Roman Agrarian History," *Klio* xiii (1913), 192 f.

⁶⁰ Livy, *Epit.* lviii; cf. Sallust, *Bell. Jug.* 42, 1.

Gracchi?⁶¹ Were they genuinely concerned with their problem as they were by the various conditions affecting Romans? Kontchalovsky has argued that Tiberius was not concerned with aiding the allies, that in fact the "Italians" of whom Appian speaks,⁶² were not the "Italian allies," but the *plebs rustica*, who were Roman citizens, and that the allies suffered because of the *lex agraria*.⁶³ Appian believes that the attempts of Gaius to extend the franchise were half-hearted or designed to gain the support of the allies for his election to a third term.⁶⁴ Cicero, who did not think highly of the Gracchan reforms, concludes that the Gracchi were unjust in their policy toward the allies, that they were willing to mitigate the sufferings of their fellow citizens at the expense of their allies.⁶⁵

Kontchalovsky's arguments are provocative and they deserve consideration.⁶⁶ That Tiberius would ultimately have permitted Italians to benefit from his *lex agraria* cannot be proved.⁶⁷ We know that the allies had a real grievance, since Tiberius' law proposed to draw in illegal holdings of citizens and allies alike, but to distribute new lots only to citizens.⁶⁸ We know, too, that the menace of eviction weighed heavily upon them, how heavily is demonstrated by the fact that the Social War was localized precisely in those regions where the agrarian commissioners had been most active.⁶⁹ At the same time, Appian's statement that the allies preferred Roman citizenship to the possession of public land cannot be ignored.⁷⁰

⁶¹ On the general problem of the allies cf. J. Göhler, *Rom und Italien* (Breslau, 1939), 70-194; A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford, 1939), 126-129.

⁶² E.g. Appian I, 9; I, 3, 19. ⁶³ Kontchalovsky, *op. cit.*, 161-185.

⁶⁴ Appian I, 3, 23. ⁶⁵ Cicero, *De Rep.* I, 19, 31; III, 29, 41.

⁶⁶ G. Cardinali, "Capisaldi della legislazione agraria," *Historia* VII (1933), 524-529, disagrees mainly on the basis of the *lex agraria* of 111 B.C., lines 21 ff. and 31 ff. Cf. E. G. Hardy, *Roman Laws and Charters* (Oxford, 1912), 61 f., 65.

⁶⁷ Cf. Hardy, *op. cit.*, 38; H. Last, Review of J. Göhler, "Rom und Italien," *Journal of Roman Studies* XXX (1940), 82 f.

⁶⁸ Cf. Cicero, *De Rep.* I, 19, 31; III, 29, 41; Appian I, 3, 19.

⁶⁹ J. Carcopino, "Les lois agraires des Gracques et la guerre sociale," *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, No. 22 (1929), 3-23. But see Sherwin-White, *op. cit.*, 127, who rightly holds that there were other provocative incidents that roused the Italians to protest. ⁷⁰ Appian I, 3, 21.

Tiberius, of course, did not live long enough to observe the difficulties raised by his reform, and it would be rash to insist that he would have attempted to meet the problem in a liberal fashion. Yet it may be suggested that both Tiberius and Gaius may have been impressed by their teacher, Blossius, with the Stoic idea of the brotherhood of man. In 126, when Rome was crowded with non-citizens, many of whom must have been Italians, the tribune, Marcus Pennus, perhaps at the instance of the Senate, proposed a law for their expulsion.⁷¹ It was Gaius Gracchus who vainly argued that other states had brought ruin upon themselves by banishing foreigners.⁷² Moreover, it was a former associate of Tiberius, M. Fulvius Flaccus, who in 125 attempted to solve the Italian question by a bill which apparently offered to all allies, whether of Latin or of lesser status, the option of enfranchisement or *provocatio*.⁷³ In putting forward this radical solution Flaccus was evidently acting in behalf of the land commission, of which he had recently been a member. The bill was not even put to the vote, but the interests of the Italians may not have been wholly neglected.

In this connection Carcopino makes an interesting suggestion, which has been elaborated by Cary,⁷⁴ Cary believes that on the withdrawal of Flaccus' bill, the Gracchan censors of 125, Cn. Servilius and L. Cassius, showed unprecedented generosity in testing the claims of applicants for registration as citizens, so that the number of citizens leapt at one bound from 317,923, to 394,736.⁷⁵ This increase of 24 per cent has generally been interpreted as an indication of the effects of the *lex agraria*.⁷⁶ But Cary argues that citizens alone received allotments, and these had been inscribed on the census lists (as *capite censi*) before they became landholders. Moreover, the census of 131, which on this hypothesis should have recorded a very large rise in the number of citizens, showed an increase of a mere 890 over the figures of 136. Hence,

⁷¹ Cicero, *Brutus* 28, 109; *De Off.* III, 11, 47.

⁷² Festus, ed. W. M. Lindsay, 362.

⁷³ Appian I, 3, 21; I, 5, 34; Valerius Maximus IX, 5, 1.

⁷⁴ Carcopino, *op. cit.*, 10-12; cf. Cary, *op. cit.*, 287 and p. 296, n. 15.

⁷⁵ Census statistics in Livy, *Epit.* LVI, LIX, LX, LXIII.

⁷⁶ Theodor Mommsen, *History of Rome* (Eng. tr., N. Y., 1911), III, 335; Stern, *op. cit.*, 245; Frank, *Econ. Survey* I, 217, n. 3; 239.

Cary believes that by an underhanded method many Italians received the franchise.⁷⁷

It is, of course, possible that since few proletarians had been levied for army service before the Gracchan period, no serious effort had been made to enroll them in the census. Since, however, Tiberius apparently considered military needs in his distribution of lands, the new leaseholders would certainly be listed for army service. In that case, the increase in the census lists would be explained not by Cary's hypothesis, that allies were registered by subterfuge, but by the fact that the land commission assigned lots to citizens who had hitherto not appeared on the lists. As for the argument that the census returns for 131 showed only a slight increase over the returns for 136, it may be that the actual repopulation of the *ager publicus* did not begin immediately after the enactment of Tiberius' law. The preliminary business of ascertaining and delimiting the land available for distribution may have occupied a year or so, in which case the new allotment holders could not have taken possession of their farms until 131 or even later. In spite of the intervention of Scipio Aemilianus, the agrarian commission continued its work and undoubtedly large numbers of *proletarii* were either raised to the ranks of *assidui* by the acquisition of land or enrolled in the hope of acquiring land.

Cary's suggestion that Gracchan censors permitted the enrollment of some allies as citizens cannot, however, be ignored, despite the absence of definitive proof. We know that after the death of Scipio proposals were made for the enfranchisement of the allies. We cannot be sure of the truth of Appian's account that citizenship was offered as a mere bribe to secure allied acquiescence in the application of the *lex agraria*.⁷⁸ We have seen that Gaius opposed Pennus' law forbidding aliens access to the city; we know, moreover, that both Gaius and M. Fulvius Flaccus took up the cause of the allies.

At all events, one cannot insist that Gaius had no interest in the

⁷⁷ Appian I, 3, 24, records that the colonists for Junonia were collected by Gaius "from all parts of Italy," a phrase which suggests to Last, *op. cit.*, 81, that Gaius had been trying to carry out, on a small scale, a clandestine enfranchisement of the Italians.

⁷⁸ Appian I, 3, 21.

allies. That the franchise was withdrawn by Flaccus was due not to Gaius but to the conservative Senate and the people, who selfishly refused to share their privileges. Certainly the revolt of Fregellae must have shown all thinking men that the problem of the allies would have to be faced soon.⁷⁹ Last, in fact, believes that it was for the sake of this reform, which was the dominating feature of his program, that Gaius risked and lost all his hard-won influence.⁸⁰ That Gaius' proposals for the enfranchisement of the allies was an eleventh-hour attempt to gain their support in behalf of his re-election seems to me improbable. It is possible that the allies might have intimidated voters in his behalf; for that reason, perhaps, they were to be excluded from Rome by order of the Senate.⁸¹ But Appian's statement that Gaius sought to give the allies the right of suffrage in order to have their help in the enactment of laws cannot be accepted.⁸² The proposal came in the summer of 122, very shortly before the tribunician elections.⁸³ Since some time would have to be spent in registering the allies, it is difficult to see how they could have been enrolled in time for the election. Furthermore, Gaius knew the opposition which franchise bills had created in the past. Despite the possibility that he stood to lose more votes than he could possibly gain, he persisted in introducing his measure. The proposal was broached, and presumably in good faith. That it failed was not the fault of Gaius but of the Senate and the people. In trying to extend citizenship Gaius consciously backed an unpopular cause, and one which wrecked his program. He may have been impolitic, unwise, but certainly he was not unfair to the allies.

Unfortunately, we can never reconstruct in any objective fashion Gaius' scheme or schemes, for we cannot know what part of his whole program the laws he introduced were. We cannot know whether political reform was an end in itself, or a means to a more desirable end. But from the evidence we possess, it would seem that Gaius' aims and motives, like Tiberius', were essentially con-

⁷⁹ Livy, *Epit.* LX; Plutarch, *Gaius* 3, 1.

⁸⁰ Last, *op. cit.*, 50; cf. Holmes, *op. cit.*, 1, 21 f.

⁸¹ Plutarch, *Gaius* 12, 1; Appian 1, 3, 23.

⁸² Appian, *loc. cit.* ⁸³ Last, *op. cit.*, 78.

servative and their respective goals desirable, even necessary. Tiberius apparently strove for some reform in the social structure of the state; Gaius attempted both social reform and, at first, moderate political reform. Opposition to moderate reform embittered both Tiberius and Gaius, and caused them to attempt constitutional and political innovations which were not always well conceived or desirable.

Admittedly both were sincere and honest men, devoted to Rome. The measures which they proposed were for the most part excellent examples of conservative reform which preserves rather than destroys a state and its constitution. It must be granted that their methods were not always in accordance with tradition, but tradition is by no means sacrosanct, and, at all events, undesirable methods were largely forced upon them by a recalcitrant and short-sighted opposition. The Gracchi are called radicals or demagogues, but these epithets cannot easily be applied to men of fundamental moderation. The tendency is to blame them for their failure and for the creation of party strife. This they could not have foreseen. The Gracchi did not create a class conflict. The seeds of social and political injustice and inequality had been sown long before the Gracchi. The Gracchi merely turned men's minds to problems which became more, rather than less, insistent on solution. At least they attempted to diagnose the ills that beset the Roman body politic and to prescribe for them. Their diagnosis was sometimes superficial; their remedies sometimes drastic. But the senatorial oligarchy, which had wielded power so long, seemed unable and unwilling to solve these pressing problems. It was the Senate which insisted on retaining the *status quo* in a world which had changed. The refusal of the oligarchy to seek remedies for situations that cried for remedies or to adopt and to improve upon the Gracchan remedies evoked a revolution that led to civil war. This violence was only brought under control by the establishment of the *pax Augusta*. As Syme says:⁸⁴ "The *nobiles* by their ambition and their feuds had not merely destroyed their spurious Republic; they had ruined the Roman people."

⁸⁴ R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), 513.

ARISTOPHANES' INFLUENCE UPON PUBLIC OPINION

By H. LLOYD STOW
University of Oklahoma

Aristophanes is frequently termed the greatest poet ever to produce political comedy, and few who have read the brilliant plays of this gifted writer have cause to doubt the justice of this tribute. His wit, his satire, his poetry appeal to all, and the many scholars who have turned their attention to the varied aspects of this poet's genius have not exaggerated but only made more manifest how merited is his reputation.

Because of the modern appreciation of the high rank of Aristophanes as a political and social dramatist, however, there has been a resultant widespread belief that he also exerted a potent influence in the daily life and opinions of the Athenians of his own time. Old Comedy—and what do we know in any detail of Old Comedy save for the plays of Aristophanes?—is thought to have wielded great power within the Attic state. The bitter abuse of individuals, the scathing attacks upon representatives of certain party groups, all contribute to this belief, most pertinently expressed by Deschanel:

Except for the fact that it was not of daily occurrence, ancient comedy at this period was in a sense analogous to modern journalism, a real power beyond the limits of official powers, a kind of free institution which completes the others, and which controls them, which in case of need modifies or reverses them, unmakes or remakes them. Attic comedy was even, at times, as terrible and as formidable as that strange custom which we call ostracism; it was only an ostracism less immediate and less absolute.¹

For two reasons this impression is a very logical one. There is, first of all, the inherent reaction of the modern reader to the plays of Aristophanes. It is difficult for anyone today to conceive that

¹ M. E. Deschanel, *Études sur Aristophane*, 7 f.; cf. E. Curtius, *History of Greece*, IV 87-89; J. Denis, *La comédie grecque*, I, 138-140.

these plays, largely devoted to personal and shameless attacks upon prominent individuals in all branches of public life, could be produced at the greatest festival of the year, before practically the entire citizen body of the Attic state, and not have a great influence upon the spectators, bringing ridicule and disgrace upon the persons mentioned. Such, it is felt, would certainly be the case today. Secondly, and perhaps more directly, this impression is caused by Aristophanes' own statements concerning his power and influence. Aristophanes clearly looked upon himself as a teacher and adviser of the state. Reformer may possibly be too strong a word to apply to his own estimate of himself, but, despite vehement arguments to the contrary, the poet's own words clearly reveal that he considered himself in some such light—the enemy of the demagogues, the sycophants, the innovators, the hypocrites who were the curse of the Attic state and of Athenian society. His mission was to expose and overthrow such men. One must be on his guard against taking the remarks of Aristophanes too seriously, it is true. But despite the surface humor of the speeches, there is nonetheless a consistent and serious motif running through the parabases which no reader can overlook.² The modern reader may or may not accept these statements at their face value, but unconsciously he is inclined to accept Aristophanes at his own estimate of himself, and to look upon him as a potent political and social factor in the Fifth Century.

This rather general belief, however, has not gone unchallenged. A few writers, while clinging tenaciously and fondly to the theory that Aristophanes was a public power in his own day, nonetheless feel constrained to warn the reader that oftentimes the poet's efforts were unavailing. At least two writers have made definite statements concerning this point. Both Gilbert Norwood and J. W. White state emphatically that Aristophanes was not able to harm the individuals whom he attacked.³ But neither writer accompanies his flat pronouncement with any discussion, and consequently

² Cf. *Achar.* 633–660; *Knights* 507–580; *Clouds* 518–562, esp. 549 f.; *Wasps* 1015–1052, esp. 1029 f.; *Peace* 734–818, esp. 759 f.; *Frogs* 686–704.

³ Norwood, *Greek Comedy*: London, Methuen (1936), 25 f.; J. W. White, Intro. to M. Croiset, *Aristophanes and the Political Parties at Athens*, xiii.

opposing views are still advanced in more recent publications. Accordingly, it may well be advantageous to see what arguments may be brought forward to substantiate the view that Aristophanes wielded no influence in the daily opinions and decisions of the Athenian people.

The individual whom Aristophanes most bitterly hated, the object of his most violent and unrestrained attack, was unquestionably the demagogue Cleon. Not only did the poet bitterly disapprove of Cleon the politician and of the political class which he represented, but his feeling toward the man went far beyond general satire and ridicule; it developed into a personal hatred of the man himself.⁴ Despite insufficient references, we can reconstruct this feud with some degree of certainty as far as the main points are concerned.⁵ Aristophanes attacked Cleon in the *Babylonians*, a play he produced in 426 B.C. The demagogue evidently suffered very bitter abuse in this drama;⁶ he felt that the poet had been too unrestrained in his attack, especially since the play had been presented at the City Dionysia when the allies were present. Cleon considered he had been made ridiculous not only in the eyes of Athens but of the entire Athenian Empire as well. To the best of our knowledge Cleon accused Aristophanes of "having spoken ill of the city in the presence of strangers" and of "having insulted public officials, elected or chosen by lot."⁷ We do not know what sort of penalty such a charge as this carried, but at any rate Aristophanes seems to have escaped unharmed.⁸

In the *Acharnians*, produced in the following year, however,

⁴ It is surprising to find Rogers, Intro. to *Knights* xxvi f., discounting any personal feeling between the two men. He thinks Aristophanes hated Cleon only because of the political policies which the latter advocated. This probably was the situation at the beginning, but it seems obvious that the feeling soon became personal.

⁵ For this immediate discussion cf. H. L. Stow, *Violation of the Dramatic Illusion in the Comedies of Aristophanes*: University of Chicago (1936), 65 ff.

⁶ For reconstructions of the plot cf. Croiset, *op. cit.*, 40-44; Norwood, *op. cit.*, 282-287. ⁷ *Achar.* 377-379, 502-505, and scholiasts on the passages.

⁸ Croiset, *op. cit.*, 50, thinks the penalty was most probably quite a severe one, but Aristophanes was acquitted when the case came to trial. Grote, *Hist of Greece*, vi, 488, says the only punishment such a charge could carry would be a small fine, but that we know no details because the case never came to trial. This divergence of views only emphasizes the deep obscurity in which all the details of this affair are hidden.

Cleon is not directly attacked. Aristophanes thanks the people for saving him from the charges of Cleon, he makes various scurrilous remarks at the politician in passing, but the plot and the characters do not deal at all with the man. The poet is evidently slightly chastened. But the next year Aristophanes brought forth the *Knights* and, with renewed courage, he directed against Cleon the bitterest ridicule of his career, picturing him as a vulgar and rascally slave who in the end is completely overthrown and disgraced. One must recall at just what period in Athenian history this unbridled attack is made. The preceding fall Cleon had gained his greatest triumph with the capture of Sphacteria and was at the height of his popularity. The *Knights* was produced in February of 424 B.C. when Cleon as the hero of the day was enjoying for the first time his right of *proedria* in the theatre. One can imagine his shock and fury at seeing himself ridiculed so villainously. In addition, the play was so heartily enjoyed by the audience that it was awarded first prize. How pleasing if we could say that this prize indicated an awareness on the part of the citizens to the defects of the demagogue. But the facts prove just the opposite. For less than two months later Cleon was elected general, one of the highest offices of the state.

After the *Knights* Cleon once again took steps to check Aristophanes. But this time he used different methods and brought a γραφὴ ἔντιας against the poet, charging that he had fraudulently used the title citizen.⁹ We have no information as to the developments of this charge. From a remark of the poet's in the *Wasps* (1284-1291) we may be justified in assuming that Aristophanes found he was this time in real difficulty and could count for no support from the people who had applauded the very remarks for which he was now being attacked. He was frightened and evidently made some private settlement with Cleon, the terms of which were hardly to the poet's credit. At any rate, the next year, in the *Clouds*, Aristophanes steers clear of all political affairs and concentrates his satire upon Socrates. But in 423 B.C., just when Cleon had been appointed commander-in-chief to oppose Brasidas in

⁹ G. Gilbert, *Beiträge zur innern Geschichte Athens*, 193 f., argues convincingly that this charge was made after the production of the *Knights* and not after the *Babylonians*, as the scholiast states.

Thrace, the poet again attacks and ridicules the statesman, though under the name and character of *Kōων* in the famous trial-of-the-dog scene in the *Wasps*. With this play the feud proper ends, for Cleon was killed at Amphipolis the following year. Aristophanes is not willing, however, to let him rest even in death, and incidental slurs are cast at Cleon, even as late as 405 B.C., when the *Frogs* was presented.

Such, in brief, is the history of the campaign Aristophanes waged against Cleon, a campaign of which the poet is extremely proud. Over and over again he boasts of his courage in attacking the demagogue; and he even claims his efforts were successful.¹⁰ But the facts do not bear him out. The people turn from approval of the poet's bitterest attack and give to Cleon his highest honor. At no time does Aristophanes seem ever to have diminished the demagogue's power or popularity.¹¹ True, Cleon twice took steps to punish his enemy, but is this not understandable on the grounds of insulted personal pride? Had he really feared the poet or his influence, surely there were many ways in which he could have effectively silenced him.

One of the most famous instances of supposed influence of the stage is the harm which Socrates is thought to have suffered as the result of the comic poet's ridicule. Critics are almost unanimous in pointing to the *Clouds* as one of the chief causes of Socrates' condemnation, basing their views upon the brief statements in the *Apology*.¹² Space does not permit a full quotation of this well-known passage, but it is doubtless familiar to every reader. Grote says of it that here is "striking proof that these comedians were no impotent libellers. Socrates manifests greater apprehension of the effect of the ancient impressions than of the speeches which had just been delivered against him."¹³ Lord remarks:¹⁴

The Athenian crowd were not keen to distinguish between the caricature and

¹⁰ Cf. *Clouds* 549 f.; 581-587; *Wasps* 1029 f.; *Peace* 759 f.

¹¹ Cf. Müller-Strübing, *Aristophanes und die historische Kritik*, 57-60, for a vehement discussion of the ineffectiveness of Aristophanes' attacks upon Cleon.

¹² Plato, *Apol.* 18a-19c; cf. *Phaedo* 70b-c.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, VIII 275, cf. 331; cf. Curtius, *Hist. of Greece*, IV, 149; M. W. Humphreys' edition of the *Clouds*, p. 10.

¹⁴ L. E. Lord, *Aristophanes, His Plays and His Influence*: Boston, Marshall Jones (1925), 40 f.

the reality (cf. Socrates in the *Clouds*). And so effective was the satire that in the minds of many the caricature replaced the reality. . . . It is impossible to escape the conclusion that this play was one of the chief causes for his conviction and execution. It is a vivid proof of the potent influence of Aristophanes, for better or worse, on his own generation.

Now it is very strange if the comic poets, who were so futile in their attacks upon Cleon and other public figures, should have met with such pointed success in the case of Socrates. Is there not another way of looking at this situation? Do not the facts favor a different explanation? We know that Socrates was disliked by the general public.¹⁵ The great philosopher's manner of life, his ideals, his standard of values were at variance with those of the average man. His practice of questioning anyone and everyone, his devastating success in routing an opponent in argument, the misuse which students made of his teachings—all contributed to his general disfavor. Also, no matter how justly or unjustly, he was associated in the popular mind with the Sophists, a group in great public disrepute. Unquestionably Socrates was unpopular in Athens and was perhaps considered somewhat in the light of a public nuisance in 423 B.C., when the *Clouds* was presented. Is not Aristophanes merely reflecting this public attitude in his play? Having decided to ridicule the Sophists, a school for which the conservative poet had little sympathy, he could not have resisted selecting for his target the teacher whose person and life furnished such rich material for burlesque. Socrates was ready-made material for a satirist. It seems highly unlikely that the play was intended as a deliberate and malicious attack upon Socrates personally. For in the *Symposium* of Plato Socrates and Aristophanes are shown as the best of friends, and the brilliantly clever speech which Plato puts into the mouth of the poet is certainly in keeping with the character of the comedian as revealed to us in the plays. We are not justified in assuming the friendship to be purely a fictional one, and believing the two men to have been on terms of actual hostility.

This view is further borne out by a story told by Plutarch, a story which probably contains a great deal of truth. The writer says that after Aristophanes had produced the *Clouds*, casting all manner of

¹⁵ Cf. Diogenes Laertius, *Soc.* II, 21; Plutarch, *De Educatione Puerorum* 14.

insult upon Socrates, some one of those present asked the philosopher if he was not angry at being so ridiculed. "By Zeus, no indeed," replied Socrates, "for I am made fun of in the theatre just as at a great banquet."¹⁶

Ridicule in the theatre was, after a fashion, good clean fun. It was not the comic poet whom Socrates feared; rather, it was the attitude of the public mind which was revealed by the comic poet. The character of Socrates in the *Apology* definitely says "The names (of these slanderers) I do not know and cannot tell—unless in the chance case of a comic poet." He clearly considered the poet to be one of a large group of people. The poet was giving expression to an attitude already widespread; he probably connected some ridiculous associations with the name of Socrates and perhaps strengthened the prejudices fomented against the philosopher by his enemies. "The same feeling against Socrates which made a condemnatory verdict possible no doubt existed when the *Clouds* was written, and encouraged Aristophanes to write the play."¹⁷ It is this feeling, this attitude which Socrates feared. He mentions the comic poets almost incidentally as examples of what he means, but not as the actual individuals who cause his unpopularity, which latter view is so greatly emphasized by modern critics. And therein lies a great distinction. There is no question but that public views are reflected in the comedies. But that public views were directly influenced by the comedies is a far different matter. Undoubtedly the play did contribute to Socrates' unpopularity, for it gave definite expression to a general view, but the fact that nearly twenty-five years passed before this much talked of "effect" came about would seem to negate the direct bearing of the *Clouds* upon the condemnation of Socrates.

The *Peace* has frequently been cited as a politically influential comedy. "The *Peace* had a potent influence in bringing about the Peace of Nicias, which was signed not long after."¹⁸ Such an interpretation, however, places undue emphasis upon the play and does

¹⁶ Plutarch, *op. cit.*, 14c.

¹⁷ W. C. Green's ed. of the *Clouds*, 15; cf. C. C. Felton's ed., x.

¹⁸ Lord, *op. cit.*, 77; cf. F. A. Paley's ed. of the *Peace*, x: "It is not too much to say, that the *Peace* was composed expressly to urge the acceptance of peace, and the more earnestly from the failure of the former negotiations."

not fully take into consideration the historical background of the period. For peace was practically already concluded when the poet presented his play. Athens, having suffered severe reverses at Delium and at Amphipolis, no longer had her former confidence in her strength and feared a rebellion of her allies. Sparta, on the other hand, was desperately anxious to recover the Lacedaemonian captives taken at Sphacteria, her country was being plundered, the helots were deserting, and she feared a revolution. Both sides were for the first time desirous of peace. Cleon and Brasidas had both been killed at Amphipolis in 422 B.C., and thus the two chief obstacles to peace were removed. Thucydides expressly tells us: "Indeed it so happened that directly after the battle of Amphipolis and the retreat of Ramphias from Thessaly, both sides ceased to prosecute the war and turned their attention to peace."¹⁹ With the suspension of hostilities and the negotiations between the two states, peace was practically certain.²⁰ The play was presented at the City Dionysia in March of 421 B.C., the Peace of Nicias was concluded in March or April of 421 B.C., "directly after the City Dionysia."²¹ Peace was in all the air and it is the joy of this peace which we find reflected in the drama.²² This play is assuredly a reflection of the popular mind, and it cannot be argued that the poet exerted, or even intended to exert, any influence upon public opinion or upon state negotiations.

In connection with this point, it might be well to point out that in 425 B.C., shortly after the production of the prize-winning *Acharnians*, with its vigorous and genuine peace propaganda, the Athenians proceeded to the Pylos affair, one of their more venturesome military undertakings. The play seems to have been wholly ineffective.

Probably the most famous and most highly praised passage in all Aristophanes is the noble parabasis of the *Frogs*, in which the poet bravely entreats the state to readmit to citizenship the men disfranchised because of participation in the oligarchic revolution of the Four Hundred.²³ When this play was first presented, in the

¹⁹ Thucydides v, 14. ²⁰ Cf. Croiset, *op. cit.*, 110; J. van Leeuwen's ed. of *Peace*, iii f.

²¹ Thucydides v, 19 f.

²² Cf. G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, III², 1196.

²³ *Frogs* 686-737; cf. Denis, *op. cit.*, II, 157-161.

spring of 405 B.C., the audience admired this parabasis so highly that they crowned the poet with a wreath of the sacred olive instead of the customary ivy, an exceptional tribute, and demanded for the play the honor of a second presentation.²⁴ The fact that in the following year the Athenians actually did take the step the poet recommended and received back into citizenship the exiles and disfranchised people has led many writers to point to the *Frogs* as the immediate cause of the restoration decree. Rogers says:²⁵

It tells much for the generosity of the Athenian people, that instead of resenting the poet's appeal, they rewarded it with the highest and most exceptional honours. . . . And this is fully borne out by the well-known fact that on the next political crisis, immediately after the disaster of Aegospotami, the Athenians followed to the letter the advice of Aristophanes, and their very first step was to enfranchise the disfranchised citizens.

Whether Rogers realized it or not, he has included in his conclusion the crux of the rebuttal. For the Athenians did *not* follow Aristophanes' sound and excellent advice at the time he gave it to them, when it might have done them some good. They acclaimed his lofty sentiments, but they did not really feel called upon to act in accordance with the advice. "They estimated Aristophanes more highly as a poet than as a statesman."²⁶ In the preceding summer Arginusa, despite the sadness and horror which followed the naval battle, had been a signal victory, the like of which Athens had not had for many years. She had won again her mastery of the seas, and, relying on the fleet in which she had sunk her last drachma, she rejected the peace proposals tendered by Sparta in a last desperate effort to avoid the humiliation of a Persian alliance, which meant Greek dependency. In the same frame of mind, Athens rejected the proposals of Aristophanes. Then came the appalling slaughter at Aegospotami. The entire fleet of 180 ships was destroyed, 3000 Athenian captives were executed, only Conon of all the generals escaping alive. This was the end of the war and the end of Athens. The city, preparing for a final death siege and bereft of manpower, then at last restored full citizenship to all who had lost it for any reason other than blood-guiltiness or treason. This

²⁴ Bergk, *Prolegomena De Comedia*, XII.

²⁵ Intro. to *Frogs*, vi. f.

²⁶ *Cambridge Ancient History*, v, 360.

act was certainly not the result of Aristophanes' advice but the consequence of tragic military reverses which forced Athens to pass the decree. The Athenians

recognized too late what harm they had done themselves. . . . On that day the author of the *Frogs* was vindicated. He had not possessed sufficient influence to force his passionate and thoughtless fellow-citizens into useful activity at the opportune moment, but he did have the merit of discovering what was right and of saying it frankly and in beautiful words.²⁷

The attack upon Cleon and the demagogues, the ridicule of Socrates, the so-called "propaganda"—really jubilation—in the *Peace*, and the political advice in the *Frogs*, furnish the four instances most frequently cited to prove the influence of Aristophanes' plays. If it has been successfully argued that this influence was negligible, it is reasonable to assume that the same was true in the case of less emphasized attacks. Space does not permit a full discussion of these points, but it may be noted in passing that the poet Cratinus is ridiculed in the *Knights* (526 f.), and yet the next year his comedy was awarded first prize over the *Clouds*. Political clubs are rather incidentally attacked in the *Lysistrata* (574–578), yet these organizations flourished despite even much more powerful opposition from legal quarters.²⁸ Tremendous pan-Hellenic feeling is displayed in the *Lysistrata* and in the *Peace*, and powerful arguments are advanced for the union of all Greece, but, as history proves all too tragically, these arguments were futile. It seems impossible to point to a single individual, political party, or theory, which was harmed or even seriously menaced by the attacks of Aristophanes. Ofttimes the poet was no doubt a nuisance to certain prominent individuals, but he could not turn the majority against them. He frequently reflected the view of a section of his audience and of the general public, but there is no proof that he influenced any large number of his audience or readers who were not already so inclined.

²⁷ Croiset, *op. cit.*, 163.

²⁸ Cf. Croiset, *op. cit.*, 136 f.

NOTES

[All contributions in the form of notes for this department should be sent direct to Alfred P. Dorjahn, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

THUCYDIDES AND GEOPOLITICS

The political history of nations as influenced by their position and surroundings has, in the past twenty years, received its share of emphasis. That is to say, it has recently been given a name and called a science—the science of geopolitics. The interpreters of geopolitics do not claim that all political events are governed by geography but they maintain that, since geography is the least variable of all factors determining history, geopolitical conclusions may be considered safer than others. In the recapitulation of past events geopolitical interpretations have the merit of a certain objectivity, they border on historical fatalism. In determining the future political policies of a nation the influence of Haushofer in Germany is well known. In a restricted but very realistic sense there is no question but that geopolitical factors have weighed heavily in American policies, foreign and domestic, in recent years. An excellent analysis of the place of geopolitics in American policies has been made by Nicholas John Spykman.¹

Spykman asserts that both our isolationists and interventionists were involved with the implications of a world balance of power, the former feeling that we could watch the destruction of the power balance in Europe and Asia with equanimity, the latter believing that we could not.²

In accepting the inevitable control of geography over the political fate of a nation the geopolitical historians have little concern with moral and ethical values. Spykman says:

¹ *America's Strategy in World Politics*: New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1942. ² P. 4.

The statesman who conducts foreign policy can concern himself with values of justice, fairness, and tolerance only to the extent that they contribute to, or do not interfere with, the power objective. They can be used instrumentally as moral justification for the power quest, but they must be discarded the moment their application brings weakness. The search for power is not made for the achievement of moral values; moral values are used to facilitate the attainment of power. In this kind of a world states can survive only by constant devotion to power politics.³

Other pertinent postulates of Spykman are that the balance-of-power policy is one for the Great Powers only⁴ and that most of the successful wars of history have been carried on in other peoples' territory.⁵

The historian of antiquity whose work has been called by Rostovtzeff "one of the noblest monuments of Greek genius in literature and art—a masterpiece both in detail and in its general survey," the historian whose analyses are essentially geopolitical, is Thucydides. And whether one views the existing chaos as caused by economic, ideological, political, or personal factors, the pages of Thucydides and the events he describes are illuminating and significant, perhaps more so than any historical work in existence.

A few analogies, possibly superficial, may be cited to identify Thucydides with the geopolitical viewpoint. Of the Peloponnesian War he says, "The real though unavowed cause I believe to have been the growth of the Athenian power, which terrified the Lacedaemonians and forced them into war; but the reasons publicly alleged on either side were as follows."⁶ From the speech of Hermocrates to the Sicilians we have, "Nobody is driven into war by ignorance, and no one who thinks that he will gain anything from it is deterred by fear Why did we go to war? Simply from a consideration of our own interests. . . ."⁷ Alliances are essential in power politics and the Mytilenean envoys say to their prospective allies, "Mutual fear is the only solid basis of alliance."⁸ Elsewhere the Corcyraeans say to the Athenians, "The policy of not making

³ P. 18. ⁴ P. 20. ⁵ P. 27.

⁶ I, 23. The translation here and all others in this note are by Benjamin Jowett, in the Second Edition, Revised, of *Thucydides*: New York, Oxford University Press, 1900.

⁷ IV, 59. ⁸ III, 11.

alliances lest they should endanger us at another's bidding instead of being wisdom, as we once fancied, has now unmistakably proved to be weakness and folly."⁹

To align Thucydides with the callous disregard for the moral and ethical attitudes of modern geopolitics may seem unjust. Yet Thucydides frequently states such values only as they occur as propaganda. Archibald Macleish¹⁰ could make Athens the epitome of totalitarian oppression by the substitution of modern national names for ancient, otherwise quoting directly from Thucydides.¹¹ On the other hand, David Cushman Coyle¹² could use the funeral speech of Pericles¹³ to picture Athens as the democratic ideal. And Thucydides reports these words of the Athenian envoys to the Spartans:

We are not the first who have aspired to rule; the world has ever held that the weaker must be kept down by the stronger Did justice ever deter any one from taking by force whatever he could? Men who indulge the natural ambition of empire deserve credit if they are in any degree more careful of justice than they need be.¹⁴

Thucydides was well aware that power balance was a prerogative of the Great Powers. Pagondas reminds the Boeotians that the Athenians, and those like them, will not hesitate to attack him who remains quietly at home and only defends himself.¹⁵ And Pagondas warns that, if the Boeotians are conquered, "there will be no more disputing about frontiers, but one fixed boundary, including our whole country."¹⁶

The geopolitical theory that successful wars should be carried on in other peoples' territory was apparently familiar to the Athenians and Thucydides. The Mytilenaeans say of the policy of Athens in the Peloponnesian War, "For the war will not be fought in Attica, as might be imagined; but in those countries by which Attica is supported."¹⁷

It is not suggested that Thucydides or the modern geopolitical historians are personally lacking in a concern for ethical standards.

⁹ I, 32.

¹⁰ "Thucydides in Prague," *The Nation*, October 8, 1938, 354.

¹¹ v, 85-112.

¹² *America*, National Home Library Association: Washington, D. C. (1941), 66-68.

¹³ *Thucydides*, II, 35-47.

¹⁴ I, 76.

¹⁵ IV, 92.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ III, 13.

The detachment with which they view historical events and the approach both use in analyzing the forces back of these events are, however, strikingly similar.

HENRY MONTGOMERY

MIAMI UNIVERSITY
OXFORD, OHIO

ANOTHER WORD FROM LUCIUS THE ASS

Two very regrettable omissions in my note, "Lucius the Ass as a Speaker of Greek and Latin,"¹ have been called to my attention by Professor B. E. Perry. The first is that the story appears in Apuleius not twice, but three times. The second is that all three versions of the story were discussed by Bruno Snell.² Since Snell's point was quite different from mine, and the third passage certainly calls for comment, I may beg the reader's indulgence for dwelling once more on the speech of the ass.

With respect to the first two versions of the story in Apuleius (*Met.* III, 29 and VIII, 29), Snell argued that the point of the story was lost in Latin, since only in Greek do we have any evidence that the bray of the ass was articulated by human beings with anything like the sound *o*. This evidence Snell found in the verb *δύκασθαι*, whereas the Latin words *rudere* and *rugire*, of similar meaning, suggest quite a different sound. Hence, he concluded, the ass's "O" was truly *asino proprium* (*Met.* VIII, 29) only for a Greek reader, and the *Asinus* attributed to Lucian has preserved (chaps. 16 and 38) the original version, which Apuleius adapted rather carelessly.

Against this conclusion we may object that, while it is quite likely that this story was original in Greek, the existence of the verb *δύκασθαι* has no real bearing on the question. Such verbs (cf. Eng. "bleat," "bark," "bray") are not good evidence as to how the animal-cries which they may at times refer to were heard by human ears. The cognates both for *δύκασθαι* and "bray" suggest that these words originally had a wider application, and that only by convention in Greek and English were they restricted to the

¹ CLASSICAL JOURNAL XXXVII, 531-533.

² "Das I-Ah des Goldenen Esels," *Hermes* LXX (1935), 355 f.

ass.³ In any case, the resemblance in sound between these verbs and the actual cries can only be regarded as approximate, whereas passages such as these in Apuleius and others discussed in my note are in themselves better evidence. The Greek versions of this story suggest that the ass said ω on both occasions. If the classical pronunciation of this vowel is observed, the story in Greek has an excellent point, quite apart from the existence of $\delta\gamma\kappa\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha$, since we hear the bray of the ass as a long and certainly open vowel. If ω were given some other pronunciation, e.g. the long but close sound which it had at a later period, the point of the story would be blurred, though it may still have been comprehensible. However, that Apuleius, at least, gave ω the open sound is indicated by the facts that, on the first occasion (*Met.* III, 29), he took care to indicate that Lucius spoke Greek (*inter ipsas turbelas Graecorum genuino sermone non-men augustum Caesaris invocare templavi*), and, on the second occasion (*Met.* VIII, 29), he found an equivalent expression in Latin (*porro Quirites*) in which the first *o* would be short, and therefore open. In both cases, apparently, he avoided the Latin δ , a close vowel, when he might easily have used it (e.g., δ *Caesar*, *prō fidem*, δ *cives*, *prō Iuppiter*—all would be fair equivalents for ω *Kaīσap* or ω *Zeū* in these circumstances). His choice would seem to be deliberate, so that the point of the story in all four cases, Greek and Latin, is the open sound of the *o*.

The third version of the story, however, raises a difficulty for this interpretation. Here (*Met.* VII, 3) Lucius relates how, when he overheard one of the robbers giving that account of the events at the house of Milo which had been accepted locally, he was moved to cry out indignantly at the charge that he himself had been guilty of the robbery of his host. Lest his silence should be interpreted as acquiescence in the charge, he wished to deny it—(*volui dicere*, “*Non feci*”). Indeed, he did shout the first word once or twice emphatically enough, but he could not deliver the second, so that he stuck on the first sound, and repeatedly cried, “No!

³ Boisacq (*Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, ed. 3: Paris [1938]) lists a number of cognates, most of which have the meaning “groan.” “Bray” was formerly used in English with such subjects as horses, oxen, deer, etc.; it may be related to Latin *fragor*; cf. the *New English Dictionary*.

No!" though he rounded his lips exceedingly—*et identidem boavi* "Non, Non," *quamquam nimia rotunditate pendulas vibrassem labias*.

In this case, to be sure, Apuleius has not avoided *ō*, so that the point of the story is not so clear as it was before. I can only suggest either that Apuleius counted on having made the point sufficiently clear on the first occasion (*Met.* III, 29), so that a more general resemblance would do here, or that this much-used word, like the English "no," "na," "naw," etc., was subject to some dialectic or personal variation in form, so that an open *o* could be heard in *nōn*, after all. Perhaps it was this peculiarity in sound which the last clause (*quamquam . . . labias*) was designed to emphasize; otherwise, *nimia rotunditate* seems pointless.

The *Asinus*, admittedly an abridgment of the tale, has nothing similar to this episode. Snell, however, argued, as before, that the Latin version of the story, being pointless in itself, must depend upon a Greek original. In this variant, he suggested, the ass wished to say *oū τοῦτ' ἐποίησα*, but succeeded only in sounding *ōū, oū*. It is possible, we may comment, that the Greek original of the *Metamorphoses* did contain a third variant of the story, and that the ass's speech on this occasion did have this not very convincing form, but it seems useless to speculate on this point. Since there is no reason why both Latin and Greek versions cannot have been comprehensible to their readers, these stories have no bearing on the question of *Vorbilder*.

JOHN L. HELLER

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

WAS SENECA'S *HERCULES* MODELED ON AN EARLIER LATIN PLAY?

Scholars have generally believed that the influence of the earlier Latin dramatists on Seneca was very slight. W. H. Friedrich's attempt to show that his *Hercules* was closely modeled on a *Hercules* by some earlier Latin dramatist whose name is lost to us deserves refutation because it has been accepted only with some reserve in the great Schanz-Hosius literary history and because it

exhibits a method which is fairly common and in my opinion indefensible.¹

Friedrich starts from *De Oratore* III, 102, where Cicero describes the technique of Roscius in presenting two consecutive lines of an unnamed play. The first line is, *Nam sapiens virtuti honorem praemium, haud praedam petit*. This line was given by Roscius with restraint, but in the next line he allowed himself a highly emotional treatment. The second line is, *Set quid video? ferro saeptus possidet sedes sacras*. Friedrich argues with some plausibility that the scene was the return of Hercules from Hades to find the tyrant Lycus threatening his family, and that Roscius played Hercules. The first line represents the end of a philosophizing speech by Hercules as he appears, and is taken to show that the unknown dramatist had departed from the Euripidean version. This suggests the possibility that Seneca's version, which also differs from that of Euripides, closely followed this earlier version, of which we have only two lines, and Friedrich proceeds to construct a proof that Seneca did in fact imitate closely the earlier Latin version of the theme.

As a brief statement of Friedrich's method it is perhaps fair to say that he assumes that any trait in Seneca's plays which is at all worthy of admiration cannot have been originated by Seneca. If Euripides' plays were lost, we could assume that the best features were borrowed from Euripides, but we have the text of Euripides' *Hercules* and can see that the best features of this play were not borrowed from it. The best way, therefore, of avoiding the admission that these excellences originated with Seneca is to ascribe them to some Roman dramatist whose works are lost. Friedrich nowhere says explicitly that this is his method, but, on the one hand, his arguments do not make sense unless we assume on the basis of a hint here and there that this is his method, and, on the other hand, the application of this method is familiar in the criticism of Latin literature. But let us deal with the arguments and refute them singly.

The first part of the argument consists of the listing of excellences in Seneca's play which are not present in that of Euripides.

¹ W. H. Friedrich, "Euripideisches in der Lateinischen Literatur," *Hermes* LXIX (1934), 300-315.

The scene between Lycus and Megara is highly praised: *Dies ist so sein eingearbeitet, dass wir es, wie Wilamowitz hervorgehoben hat, ohne die Kenntniss des Originals unmöglich als Zutat erkennen könnten* (p. 305). Next he remarks that when Hercules returns from killing Lycus he sends Theseus off stage, a careful piece of stage management which is in contrast with the lack of any indication of Theseus' return to take part in the last act. Again, the fact that Amphitryon wishes to kill himself after the murders so as not to outlive the others gives a new and fine note of pathos. Last is the dramatically effective management of the lines wherein Hercules, returned to sanity, learns of his crime. The reader is not told that these traits are too good to have been devised by Seneca, but apparently is expected to deduce that such is the case.

The case is considered to be clinched by the argument that we can recognize the return of Hercules as Seneca's own contribution and can see the traces of the joinery where it was fitted into its model without sufficient care. In the prologue (by the unknown dramatist) Juno says that Hercules has come out of the underworld and is on his way home, but at 520-523 (by Seneca) he appears directly from the underworld, an inconsistency which has often been noticed. This appearance is also in contradiction with Theseus' account of their return (812-829, by the unknown dramatist). Further, there is no mention of Theseus in the passage where Hercules appears, a passage which is recognizable, says Friedrich, as being thoroughly in Seneca's style "with its pompous fortissimo."

Friedrich suggests, therefore, that the play is in general closely modeled on an earlier Latin version, but that Seneca clumsily inserted his own version of Hercules' return without bothering to eliminate the small contradictions which this proceeding involved. We can therefore gain from this play, he says, some understanding of the technique of a Republican dramatist whom we cannot name.

There are many and insuperable objections to this theory. In the first place, it is wrong to assume that whatever is good in Seneca does not belong to Seneca. This sort of thing has long hindered our efforts to understand Latin literature, and it is time that it were abandoned. Next, let it be noted that the highly praised

scene between Lycus and Megara is thoroughly Senecan. The longer speeches working down to *stichomythia* and the keen psychology of the parvenu and the aristocrats are quite in the Senecan manner. As for the argument that Theseus is sent off stage carefully but reappears without indication, how can we know that he was sent off stage carefully by the earlier dramatist and brought back without indication by Seneca? In any play we can see that Seneca is sometimes careful about entrances and exits and sometimes not. As for the next two points, I know no way of demonstrating that Seneca did or did not devise these small excellences. It is ridiculous to insist that they were beyond his powers.

It is true that there is a contradiction between Juno's statement in the prologue that Hercules was now out of Hades and his later appearance direct from Hades. One can easily see, however, what was gained in the prologue by Juno's being forced to contemplate his successful return and what was gained later by his appearance direct from Hades. The prologue, furthermore, is thoroughly Senecan in its psychological, rhetorical, and protatric qualities.

Friedrich's argument that he can recognize Seneca's manner in the scene where Hercules returns raises the greatest difficulty of all. He implies that the rest of the play was not written in Seneca's style, but in that of the unknown dramatist, so that we can recognize Seneca's style in the one place where it occurs. The least that he could do to support such an implication is to explain how the rest of the style differs from the norm of Seneca's style, but he has not attempted to do so. Presumably the model also had a return of Hercules at this point in the play. Why should Seneca have used his own style only at this one point in the play? Does Friedrich have any reason to suppose that Seneca followed any such proceeding in any other play? Lastly, if the style of the rest of the play is a faithful imitation of the style of some Republican dramatist and easily to be distinguished from that of Seneca, how does a style which dates before *De Oratore* allow for the clear reminiscences of Vergil in Theseus' account of the trip to the underworld?

RICHARD M. HAYWOOD

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

BOOK REVIEWS

[Review copies of classical books should be sent to the Editorial Office of the JOURNAL at Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. Such works will always be listed in the department of Recent Books, and those which seem most important to the readers of the JOURNAL will also be reviewed in this department. The editor-in-chief reserves the right of appointing reviewers.]

MICHELL, H., *The Economics of Ancient Greece*: Cambridge, at the University Press; New York, The Macmillan Co. (1940). Pp. 415. \$4.00.

Mr. Michell, professor of political economy at McMaster University, has written a general work more detailed and comprehensive than the books by Zimmern, Glotz, or Hasebroek, which will take its place at once as the most satisfactory single volume in English on the subject. Part of its solid merit rests upon consistent use of the original sources and its relative freedom from hasty generalizations. The author realizes that we can make nothing more than intelligent guesses about many Greek economic problems. His survey ends with Alexander; the economics of the Hellenistic age are too vast in their development for inclusion in a volume of this scope.

The chapters include analyses of the background of Greek economics, agriculture, mining, labor, industry, commerce, trade in various products, money, banking, and public finance. These subsume a great variety of minor subjects and assemble a mass of fascinating information discussed briefly and, on the whole, accurately. The reader for whom the book will be an introduction may be surprised to learn that the ancient Greeks knew such supposedly modern phenomena as the sales tax, "trade money," market-cornering, monopolies, economic warfare, and even what were apparently sit-down strikes and a retailers' union. He will also find much illumination on the more important divergences

between ancient Greek and modern economic life. Useful critiques are devoted to the problem of mining at Laurium and the Isthmic theory of Bérard, while the analysis of Hasebroek's views is the best criticism yet made in English on that author's *Trade and Politics in Ancient Greece*.

The treatment of the Greek attitude toward manual labor correctly points out that contempt for it arises shortly after the Persian Wars; but the author is not able wholly to dispel the prevailing uncertainty as to its extent and degree. Conflicting statements at pages 125, 144, 145 do not contribute to a clarification of the issue; every reference in the sources requires exhaustive examination before sweeping statements may be risked. Similar uncertainty appears in regard to the weakness of the Greek financial system as a cause for Greek decline. He accepts the view of Andreades that the financial system was "in all probability, the real cause of the destruction of the noblest of all states known to history." But, as with Rome, we cannot safely attribute Greek decline to a single cause, even so outstanding as this one. I should list the following as among the chief causes: the system of land tenure, slavery, unsound finance, and an economic disequilibrium which arose from a series of related factors. One of these was a serious lack of domestic foodstuffs due to a lack of arable land, this in turn due to extensive deforestation: thus arose an increasing *δλιγανθρωπία*. Further statements may be questioned: The horror of possible enslavement was scarcely the source of Greek tragedy, a suggestion made at p. 150. It is misleading to speak of "very large fortunes" (p. 125) and "enormous returns" (p. 372). At p. 26 it is unfair to give the impression that modern totalitarianism, either in theory or practice, is a return to Greek totalitarianism; there is much more involved in the question than the average reader will be able to gather from Mr. Michell's remark in the footnote. Despite the Greek subordination of the individual to the state, the individual had far more freedom of every sort than he has in Europe today. How else could the great art and literature of the Greeks have been produced, or how could Aristophanes and Euripides have written as they did? It is only a step from this lack of discrimination to the obtuse absurdity of

C. J. Friedrich, who, in a criticism of Jaeger's *Paideia* (*Review of Politics* II, 2 (1940), 219), writes: "The question we wish to raise is whether present trends do not suggest that we cut this umbilical (*sic*) cord once and for all, and rid ourselves for good of the Greek cultural heritage which is so inextricably bound up with their conception of the state." This is exquisite, but dangerous, ignorance.

Slips of a minor sort appear. It is the shield of Achilles, not of Ajax, which is described in *Iliad* xviii (p. 81). For Aristotle's *Laws* we should no doubt read *Constitution of Athens* (p. 25). The frequent references to economic life in the Bible have only a picturesque importance and no real value as evidence for Greek economics. Mr. Michell's style leaves something to be desired. He has a positive mania for the word "such," which he uses with reckless abandon and extreme vagueness of reference. To speak of a "gorgeous life" (p. 17) is to use the worst sort of undergraduate diction. Incoherent sentences appear at pp. 228 and 391. The exigencies of publication in war time are perhaps responsible for these errors: "is" omitted in n., p. 127; "doubtless," "Ardaillon" misspelled at pp. 136, 198. Add "selling into slavery was" after "Although," p. 152; insert "be" for "to" at line 2, p. 158; and read "was" for "were" after "suggests," p. 305. The page number in n. 3, p. 212, is lacking; the exact reference to Xenophon should be given at p. 195. The work of Bonner and Smith on the administration of Greek justice is absent from the Bibliography. The book needs a map.

L. R. LIND

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

GEER, RUSSEL M. *Classical Civilization: Rome*: New York, Prentice-Hall, Inc. (1940). Pp. xxiii+414. \$3.00.

This book is a companion volume to Professor Couch's *Classical Civilization: Greece*, and in external appearance is its twin. Both volumes owe their existence to the experience of the authors in teaching a course in Classical Civilization at Brown University, and both enjoy the advantages of careful revision based on the use of earlier lithoprinted editions.

Professor Geer states his purpose modestly in the first sentence of his Preface: "This book is intended for use by those who, with little or no knowledge of Latin, wish to learn something of the culture of the Romans." I may say at once that any intelligent person who reads the book will find it an accurate and reliable introduction to the history and cultural achievements of the Romans and to the important subject of our own indebtedness to ancient Rome. No doubt the book will be of special interest to teachers, who may consider using it as a text, and largely for their benefit I give a list of chapter headings together with figures to show the number of pages in each chapter.

I. Introduction, "Our Debt to Rome, Geography of Italy" (1-5). II. "The Beginnings of Rome" (6-11). III. "Rome under the Kings" (12-21). IV. "External History to 275 B.C." (22-28). V. "Internal History to 275 B.C." (29-39). VI. "The Third Century: Rome and Carthage" (40-46). VII. "The Third Century: the Constitution" (47-64). VIII. "Latin Literature" (240-100 B.C.) (65-79). IX. "Rome Expansion" (200-146 B.C.) (80-85). X. "Rome and Italy to 133 B.C." (86-94). XI. "First Phase of the Revolution: the Gracchi" (95-106). XII. "Second Phase of the Revolution: Marius and Sulla" (107-116). XIII. "Third Phase of the Revolution: Pompey and Caesar" (117-132). XIV. "Literature in the Late Republic" (133-150). XV. "Social and Economic Life in the Late Republic" (151-172). XVI. "Religion to the End of the Republic" (173-191). XVII. "Augustus" (192-209). XVIII. "Augustan Literature" (210-226). XIX. "The Empire in the First and Second Centuries after Christ" (227-247). XX. "Literature in the First and Second Centuries after Christ" (248-262). XXI. "The Empire in the Third Century and After" (263-275). XXII. "Philosophy and Religion in the Empire" (276-289). XXIII. "Roman Law" (290-299). XXIV. "Science and Engineering" (300-315). XXV. "Roman Art" (316-346). XXVI. "Transmission of Roman Influence" (347-351). XXVII. "Roman Private Life" (352-384).

The book contains also a detailed Table of Contents, a list of references giving the sources of the passages quoted in translation, a Bibliography designed for the student rather than the teacher, and a good Index.

In this volume Professor Geer has produced a masterpiece of compression with an art that conceals art. Not a word is wasted, but the reader is seldom conscious of the severe limitations of space. The material has been selected with excellent judgment and is presented clearly and accurately. The most difficult problem which confronts the author of this sort of book is how much to omit. Some of the surveys of ancient history and of classical civilization that have appeared in recent years read like summaries of larger works, with all the facts included but all the comment and interpretation left out. Such books present little more than an exercise for the memory even to able and conscientious students, whose interest soon wanes because they never see the woods for the trees. Ability to omit the non-essential requires thorough knowledge of the subject-matter, sound judgment, experience, and stern self-restraint. Professor Geer has solved this problem with remarkable success. On the positive side, the book is a readable and reliable introduction to the history and culture of the Romans.

There are a few statements which I would question. On page 140 the author refers to the lyrics of Catullus as "about a hundred short poems dashed off rapidly." It would be safer to say that they give the impression of having been dashed off rapidly. On page 248 occurs the statement "Great works of prose and poetry were produced during the century after the death of the first Emperor, but there were no writers who equaled those who had gone before." One might raise the names of Tacitus, Juvenal, and Martial. On page 256 we read "His (sc. Quintilian's) ideal of style, both in his own writing and for his pupils, was the Latinity of Cicero, and the excellence of such writers as Pliny the Younger and Suetonius is largely due to his precept and his example." The words "and Suetonius" might well have been omitted. In the chapter "Post-Augustan Literature" Seneca is represented only by his dramas. His prose works are reserved for the chapter "Philosophy and Religion" and even there only the *Letters to Lucilius* are mentioned by title.

There are very few misprints. On page xxiii read *Caesar* for *Caeser*; page 39 read *sent* for *set*; pages 76, 368, 369, 371 read *dowry* for *dow-
ery*; page 338 (under the illustration) read *Vespasian* for *Vaspasian*.

The publishers are to be congratulated on a sturdy but attractive book, well printed and well bound.

MAURICE W. AVERY

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

WILLIAMSTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS

T. MACCI PLAUTI, *Epidicus*, Edited with Critical Apparatus and Commentary by George E. Duckworth: Princeton, Princeton University Press (1940). Pp. xiv+464. \$7.50.

In the Preface of his modest classroom edition of the *Agricola*, Duane Reed Stuart, one of the Princeton group whose aid is gratefully acknowledged by Professor Duckworth, remarks that he had "aspired to instruct and not to impress." The sentiment has always pleased me, believing as I do that the decline of Latin study in American colleges is not entirely unconnected with the austere and forbidding aspect of most Latin textbooks. Frankly, when I first heard of a forthcoming five-hundred-page, \$7.50 edition of the *Epidicus*, I was—well, appalled is one word. The *Epidicus*! Since when had that seven-hundred-line play so appreciated in value as to be worth five hundred pages of attention and \$7.50 of cash?

When the volume arrived, a Princeton University Press flyer dropped out. I glanced at it. Jolly masks at the top . . . "a lusty tale of" . . . "the same spirited tradition of ribaldry" . . . "the Broadway guise of *Amphitryon 38* and *The Boys from Syracuse*" . . . "the favorite play of the popular dramatist." Now for a rollicking afternoon! Then I fingered through the volume itself. Some eighty-five pages of beautifully printed text and critical apparatus, apparatus predominating; some three hundred and twenty beautifully printed pages of commentary—nearly half a page of commentary to a line of text; two or three pages of metrical analysis; four excellent plates; some twenty-five pages of bibliography; a seven-page Index. No, not "rollicking." That could not be the right adjective, not by any means. Obviously, this book was not one to elicit many new laughs from the *Epidicus*, whatever else it did.

Then I went through the volume slowly, from Preface to Index, my respect for Professor Duckworth's purpose and performance mounting with each page.

He had entered upon this task partly as a labor of love—IN MEMORIAM ARTHUR LESLIE WHEELER. Professor Wheeler had long been collecting material—text, language, meter—for a critical edition of the *Epidicus* with a commentary when he died in 1932, and Professor Duckworth, one of his former students, had been given permission, by Mrs. Wheeler and her husband's colleagues, to carry on. And he has carried on, magnificently. The result is not merely a definitive edition that comes close to being really definitive, not merely a book that is the biggest single contribution to Plautine studies ever published in this country, but a splendid specimen of American classical scholarship at its German best.

I do not know who will ever read the volume entire, except a few professional Latinists. They will be both instructed and impressed. Graduate students will be urged to dip into it for special purposes: the play offers plenty of textual, metrical, and interpretative problems to sharpen teeth on. But fortunately its publication has been financed by Mrs. Wheeler and by Princeton funds. It is amazing and cheering that in such a year as 1940 a book with almost nothing of popular or college classroom appeal could have been printed. Yet here it is, a *monumentum perennius* or thereabouts, of its sort.

Almost everything one can possibly wish to know about the *Epidicus* is in it. Much that one may wish to know about the rest of Plautus is in it. On disputable matters not only Professor Duckworth's opinions, but the opinions of all—or nearly all—other scholars are in it, or adequately cited. The comprehensiveness of that commentary is overwhelming. As is inevitable in a definitive edition, there is occasionally too much commentary. (On page 234, for instance, Professor Duckworth gives ten lines to the *senes'* ignorance of the return of the soldiers, and quotes Wheeler as calling it "an unimportant detail"—which it assuredly is. Not quite so unimportant, yet undeserving of two pages and more of discussion [196-198] are the questions whether the Rhodian soldier was the Euboean soldier, and whether Acropolists could be sold.)

And sometimes, also—but something hard to avoid in such an edition—too much attention is accorded to the obvious. One instance is Periphanes' gullibility, to which Professor Duckworth vouchsafes six lines of comment (p. 361) quite unnecessary to any student sufficiently intelligent ever to have opened this book.

Yet any and all such criticisms are petty. Professor Duckworth has completed a genuine *magnum opus*, of a sort that American scholars seldom seem even to have contemplated. (Let me end, parenthetically, by applauding his estimate of Norwood (p. 378): "It is most unfortunate that a book on Plautus and Terence designed for the general reader should give such an erroneous impression of Plautus' language and style." The "*Mercator*"! "The Other Nineteen Plays"! The only charity I can feel toward that book comes from the faint hope that maybe its writer was just trying to make conversation.)

PAUL NIXON

BOWDOIN COLLEGE

HINTS FOR TEACHERS

[Edited by Grace L. Beede, University of South Dakota, Vermillion, S. D. The aims of this department are threefold: to assist the inexperienced teacher of Latin, to help the experienced teacher keep in touch with matters of interest to the professional world, and to serve as a receiving center and distributing point for questions and contributions on teaching problems. Questions will be answered by mail or in the pages of this department. Contributions in the form of short paragraphs dealing with projects, tests, interest devices, methods, and material are requested. Anything intended for publication should be typed on stationery of regular size. All correspondence should be addressed to the editor of this department.]

International Day

Two International Days have played their rôle at Milwaukee State Teachers' College, one of them surprisingly effective.

At the first International Day, the Latin club, *Romani Hodierni*, invited the modern language clubs for a tea and a presentation in English of cuttings from the *Mostellaria*. Reactions expressed surprise that Latin could be so much fun.

At the second International Day, the *Romani Hodierni* invited participation by the modern language clubs in a joint program. A playlet, *Cinderella*, was translated by the respective classes into Latin, Spanish, French, and German, and was presented by each club in turn to a packed audience of all the clubs.

The order of presentations offered comparison of Latin with the two romance languages, Spanish and French, and contrast of the three with German; further comparisons arose from the costuming. The Roman prince wore a *toga pura* over a *tunica lati clavi*; his herald had an improvised livery of dark red in the form of *tunica* and *lacerna*, pulled up on the shoulders to leave both arms free. The step-mother wore a white *stola* with a bright-colored scarf; the two step-sisters were in rose-colored Greek *pallae*; Cinderella and

the servants had drab and patched *tunicae*. Surprised comment showed the pleasure of the audience in the attractiveness of the Roman costumes. The Spanish cast wore modern Spanish costumes with a gorgeous mantilla for the step-mother. The French costuming was that of the eighteenth century, with gay silks and a white ceremonial wig for the step-mother. The German presentation was in baroque costumes, with heavy-colored velvets, even the fairy appearing in dark green.

As the same situations appeared in play after play, the audience shouted with appreciation. The same cardboard pumpkin, left from Halloween, the same dime-store rubber mice, the same green-paper fireplace reappeared in every production. The high spot of mirth centered in the herald, the same student having the rôle in Spanish, French, and German, and bringing down the house with his vigorous acting. Here most especially the distinctive flavor of the four languages could be felt; and here too the audience was surprised at the flexibility and eminently speakable quality of the Latin. Everyone seemed to understand all four languages.

For the use of other schools, a copy of the Latin version is added.

The English version was an adaptation of the French playlet, *Cendrillon*.¹

CINERELLA

Dramatis Personae

Mater	Numen
Anna, filia maior	Nuntius et servi
Maria, filia minor	Princeps
Cinerella	Servus

Scaena: An atrium viewed from one side, with hearth in rear center of stage, equipped with cooking utensils, and shrine or painted shrine of Lar and Penates. Hearth is *not* against the back wall, but room continues beyond. At rear, door into other rooms of house. At left, door into garden, *tablinum*, etc.; at right, doors leading to *vestibulum* and street, open. Small tables, benches or stools; couch and armchair in *tablinum*.

ACT I

MATER: (*She speaks to the elder of her daughters.*) Cirrum pone paulum magis ad illam partem, mea cara Anna; et tu, Maria, cingulum trahe paulum plus

¹ From the volume, *French Fairy Plays*, by Mathurin Dondo and M. Elizabeth Perley: New York, Oxford University Press, 1923.

ut te quam minimam facias. Vobis res maximae cogitatae sunt hoc vespere et non dubium est quin vos optimas excellentissimasque princeps noster habiturus sit. Certo scio eum unam ex vobis lecturum esse quae uxor regia sit.

ANNA: O mea mater, non est dubium quin me deligat, nam egomet pulcherrima sum et semper venustissima.

MATER: Silete nunc, meae filiae, et vos parate. Cinerellam flores proferre iam iubebo. Cinerella, statim flores profer.

CINERELLA: Ita, mea mater. Statim adveniam. (*She enters running from the left of the stage and stops, amazed at seeing her step-sisters all dressed up.*) Ah!

ANNA: Cinerella, cur ibi stas velut caulis sis?

MARIA: Agedum, Cinerella, celeriter nobis flores infige. Saltabitur hodie in palatio principis, atque nos cum principe saltabimus.

CINERELLA: O, quam mirum! O mea mater, oro te, liceat me quoque ad saltandum ire. Scio bene saltare, atque tam laeta libensque festum magnificenter videam!

MATER: Tu vis nobiscum ire! Tute! Tu habes nullam vestem idoneam! Tu vis saltare, sed nullas soleas habes. Tui nos male pudeat.

CINERELLA: O, mea mater, liceat me eo ire et in superiore parte palati stare et festum spectare.

MATER: Comprime hunc strepitum, Cinerella, et me audi. In cineres quaedam cicera effudi; tu ea eligito; tum ad lectum discede. Iam nobis quam citissime flores da. (*Cinderella unhappily takes a large rose from the basket.*)

ANNA: Ista mihi est.

MARIA: Minime, maior mihi est.

MATER: Utraque unam adipisceris. (*Cinderella pins a rose on Anne's dress.*)

ANNA: Noli me pungere.

MARIA: Huc veni, Cinerella. Rosam meam mea vice volo. (*The three depart, right, and Cinderella turns sadly to pick up peas from the hearth.*)

CINERELLA: (*Seated before the fire-place, sings any such familiar song as Mica, Mica, Parva Stella. Her voice begins firmly, but it trembles more and more, and at the end she sobs aloud. NUMEN appears.*)

NUMEN: Parva puella, cur lacrimas?

CINERELLA: O, diva pulcherrima! Misera sum. Mea mater et meae sorores ad saltandum abierunt et cum illis tam libens abiissem, sed mihi vestis idonea non est, et domi manere et cicera ex cineribus colligere necesse est.

NUMEN: Tete consolare, filia mea. Puella bona piaque semper fuisti. Nunc omnia optima accident. Tune vis saltare?

CINERELLA: Ita, in palatio principis.

NUMEN: Scilicet: I in hortum et refer mihi melopeponem. Crede te mihi, mea infans, et ad palatium ibis. Nam ego tibi currum elegantem parabo et vestem pulchram quam ad saltandum induas, et apud festum in palatio

intereris. (*Cinderella jumps for joy and claps her hands. She runs quickly and returns with a pumpkin.*)

NUMEN: Bene. Hic erit tuus currus. Pone melopeponem in solum, sis. Sed equi desunt. Habesne illas mures in muscipulo?

CINERELLA: Ibo visum, diva pulchra. (*She goes and returns immediately carrying a mouse-trap with several mice.*)

NUMEN: Bene, mea infans. Ista quoque ante melopeponem in solum pone et adsta. Iam audi diligenter. Simul atque mea virga te percussero, mutaberis. Tum in currum statim ascendas ut ad saltandum discedas. Nunc noli te commovere sed me aspice. (*The fairy touches her on the head as the curtain falls. There is a pause and one hears the mice squeak.*)

CINERELLA (*speaking behind the curtain*): O quam sum laeta, quam gaudeo! Quem currum elegantem! Quos equos optimos! Quam vestem clarissimam! Quas soleas pulcherrimas! O meas soleas elegantissimas!

NUMEN (*also behind the curtain*): Audi Cinerella, diligenter. Media nocte hoc fascinum se rumpet. Noli uno momento diutius manere, nisi vis te tui pudere.

ACT II

CINDERELLA is asleep in a corner by the hearth, scarcely visible. It is night. Mother and sisters enter the room, coming from the dance.)

MATER: Certe scire velim quis fuerit ista femina quae oculos principis in se solam traxerit. Ille quidem ad nullam aliam animadvertere voluit.

ANNA: Impudissima quidem erat. Princeps mecum profecto saltavisset nisi ista puella animum eius ad se vertisset.

MARIA: Et mecum quoque. Princeps me oculis teneris mox spectavisset. Ut egomet sibi nuberem certissime rogavisset nisi illa anser adfuisisset.

MATER: Viginti denarios pendam ut nomen illius puellae sciam. Tam similis erat Cinerellae! At non esse potest. Cinerella nullam vestem nisi veteres pannos habet.

ANNA: Cinerella? Poteratne ista ibi adesse? Ibo visum utrum in suo loco sit necne. (*She looks into the shadows near the hearth.*) Adest dormiens velut volvens turbo. Certo scire possumus istam non adfuisse.

MATER: Fortasse erat aliena regina. Quam est mirum ut ante medium noctem discesserit.

ANNA: Nescioquis dixit eam discedentem soleam suam perdidisse, quam princeps eligeret. (*Sound of horses' hoofs outside.*)

MARIA: Ita, et nescioquis etiam dixit principem hanc soleam tenere velle; quam stupidus vult.

MATER: (*Looking out of the open door*) Cito, cito, venite visum. Currus principis ante domum nostram stetit. Quid potest esse?

ANNA: Ecce me! Me uxorem lecturus est!

MARIA: Minime, minime, non te sed me.

MATER: Aspice nunc! Nescio quis descendit. (*They back up as a servant enters.*)

SERVUS: Nuntius qui ex palatio venit vos videre cupit.

OMNES: Introeat.

NUNTIUS (*followed by two servants*): Princeps noster pulcherrimus nobilissimusque me dicere vult se illam puellam quae hanc soleam suo pedi aptare possit in matrimonium delecturum esse; sic eam quam amat ille scire poterit.

ANNA et MARIA: Mihi soleam da.

NUNTIUS: Minime. Ecce principem. Inclinate vos ad eum. Ille pedes vestros iudicabit. (*Prince enters. All bow.*)

PRINCEPS: Omnes feminas quae ad palatium ad saltandum hodie venerunt hanc soleam suo pedi aptare oportet. Eam cui est pes satis parvus ut hanc soleam induat in matrimonium ducam. (*Looks toward Anna.*) Haec iuvenis pulchra eam induere conetur. (*A servant tries it on her as she sits on a bench. Cinderella draws near.*)

NUNTIUS: Princeps nobilis, iudica ipse. Ea quam corde tuo amas pedem habuit multo minorem. Hic pes est nimis latus et nimis longus.

PRINCEPS: Abeat! Alia adsit! (*Servant tries it on Maria.*)

NUNTIUS: Princeps nobilis, iudica ipse. Ea quam corde tuo amas pedem habuit multo minorem. Hic pes est nimis latus et nimis longus.

PRINCEPS: Nonne aliam filiam habes? (*Cinderella stands near.*) Illa puella soleam induere conetur. Faciem mitem habet.

MATER: O, minime, mi princeps! Ista est paupera quae ex culina numquam exit.

PRINCE: Egomet volo ea soleam suo pedi induere conetur.

NUNTIUS (*To mother and Maria*): Date mihi soleam. (*They make no move.*) Cedo soleam!—Soleam, inquam! (*Each time more loudly. Finally they give him the slipper. Servant tries it on Cinderella. It fits.*) Princeps nobilis, judica ipse. Hanc corde tuo amas. Huius pedi solea bene se accommodat, immo optime, tam exquisito et tam parvo.

PRINCEPS: Tandem meam reginam amantissimam inveni. O, quam sum felix. (*To servants.*) Cito, discedite et apportate vestem ditissimam et gemmas magnificentissimas. Parate convivium lautum in palatio, nam cras dies nuptiarum mearum erit. Et tu, meae deliciae, beatissima ex omnibus reginis eris. (*Anna and Maria look on. The NUMEN appears.*)

NUMEN: Vobis benedico, mi princeps et regina mea.

ORTHA L. WILNER

MILWAUKEE STATE TEACHERS' COLLEGE

Games for Vocabulary Review¹

The baseball game has been used with success for several years to add spirit to the review of Latin word lists. Now football, basketball, and track have been worked out by students of North High School, Des Moines, Iowa, to keep seasonal pace with the school sports. Usually the captains and teams are announced the previous day, which leads to much friendly rivalry and often to more real study.

LATIN FOOTBALL

1. Teams are picked by the two quarterbacks and arranged according to the order in which they "take the ball."
2. Let a regular football field be drawn on the blackboard on which to mark the plays. The position of the ball and the team holding it may be marked on the field with colored chalk.
3. The quarterback of each team should sit at the front and "call signals" (i.e. give the words to the other side). He may select any word he wishes out of the selected list. No correctly answered word should be used again until necessary; that is, until the list is finished. After a word is missed three times it should be eliminated. The quarterback and captain may be different pupils.
4. By flipping a coin it may be determined which team "will carry the ball" first. The defending captain will give words and the other team will gain or lose as follows, starting on the fifty-yard line: If a player answers correctly, the ball is moved forward 5 (five) yards. If one misses there is no gain. If two players miss consecutively the team loses the ball. A scorekeeper may be appointed by each side to tally touchdowns and individual scores.
5. Penalties are as follows:
 - a. "Offside"—prompting: 10 yards. The down is taken over; that is, another word is given.
 - b. "Rough playing"—talking, disturbing: 5 yards. The down is taken over; that is, another word is given.
6. After gaining possession of the ball, the team is always allowed 4 (four) downs. If 15 yards are made in the four downs, the same team is given the ball for another "first down and 15 yards to go."
7. When the ball is lost by a team, it is taken by the other team at the point at which it was lost and is carried in the other direction.
8. After a touchdown the other side takes the ball on the fifty-yard line.
9. The referee (usually the teacher) will have the final word on any conflict and will say whether an answer is right or wrong.
10. The quarterback may try for an extra point after a touchdown by being given one word. If he gives it correctly the point is made.

¹ See also *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* XXXII (1937), 245-248; XXXIII (1938), 178 f.

LATIN BASKETBALL

1. The court is 60 inches long and 40 inches wide.
2. It is divided into six parts of ten inches each.
3. Two teams (these may be any size) are chosen.
4. The ball is started in the center of the court.
5. The team which is to have the ball first, and the basket which is to be defended by each team are decided by the group.
6. Captains are chosen for both teams.
7. Each captain acts as "pitcher" for the team he does not represent.
8. The captain of one team will give vocabulary words to the other team.
9. When a captain gives a word to the defending team and the member of that team who received the word gives it correctly, the ball then advances ten inches.
10. When a word is missed, the ball goes directly to the other team from the point at which it then stood.
11. Two points are awarded for each basket.
12. After a basket is made, the ball is again set in the center of the court and given to the other team.
13. The teacher acts as referee and may penalize a team for excessive talking, thus giving the other team a free throw.
14. The team which is given a free throw receives one point after a member of that team gives correctly a word given to him by the teacher.

LATIN BASEBALL

1. Choose two captains, who select the members of their teams, using the entire class, and arrange them in batting order.
2. The captain or a team member may be pitcher for his side.
3. Two scorekeepers are chosen. Their board looks like this.

Home Runs
Bases
Outs

4. Individual scores may also be kept by the scorers.
5. The scorekeeper will also record the bases won by the person at bat in order that he may know to which base the batter is to be sent.
6. The teacher is referee, calling bases and outs.
7. The words or questions may come from word lists or may be prepared in advance.
8. Three outs retire the side.
9. Seat teams on opposite sides of room in batting order.
10. Toss up for first bat.
11. Each pitcher pitches to opposing side.
12. First batter stands and pitcher gives the word.

13. A time limit may be set for answering questions.
14. When the teams are small, if the player misses, one out is counted on his side. If he answers correctly, he may take his base or go on and take a chance at second base. If he misses on second base, he takes first base, and no out is counted; or providing he answers correctly, he may try for third base. This procedure is followed until he makes a home run or misses.
15. All players on first, second, or third base must be forced home. No stealing is allowed.
16. It also may be played with each player taking one base. A home run counts two points. Each person on base when the side is retired receives one point regardless of position.
17. One point is given for each base made—four for a home run, three for third, two for second, one for first; for example if there are players on first and second when the side is retired, their team receives three points.

LATIN TRACK

A 440-yard track is marked out on the blackboard with as many lanes as there are teams and as many equal spaces as there are runners on each team. In the running events, words are given to the first member of team "one," then to the first member of team "two," etc. Teams advance one space with each correct answer, but stand still with each incorrect one. The first team to cross the finish line wins the race. The first team gets 5 points, second 3, third 1, and fourth 0. In relay races using more than one lap, teams repeat as many times as there are laps. Events are as follows, with the amount of credit given for each correct answer in field events:

440 yd. relay (1 lap)	Javelin throw	5 ft.
880 yd. relay (2 laps)	Discus throw	3 ft.
440 yd. run (1 lap)	Shot put	2 ft.
Mile relay (4 laps)	High jump	6 in.
880 yd. run (2 laps)	Pole vault	1 ft.
2 mile relay (8 laps)	Broad jump	2 ft.
Mile run (4 laps)		

NELLIE E. WILSON

NORTH HIGH SCHOOL
DES MOINES, IOWA

CURRENT EVENTS

[Edited by George E. Lane, Thayer Academy, Braintree, Mass., for territory covered by the Association of New England and the Atlantic States; John N. Hough, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, for the Middle States east of the Mississippi River; G. A. Harrer, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., for the South-eastern States; Russel M. Geer, Tulane University, New Orleans, La., for the Lower Mississippi Valley and the Southwest; Kevin Guinagh, Eastern State Teachers' College, Charleston, Ill., and Franklin H. Potter, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia., for the Middle Western States. News from the Pacific Coast may be sent to Fred L. Farley, College of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif.]

This department will present everything that is properly news of general appeal, but considerations of space compel the editors to ask that items be made as brief as possible. Whenever feasible, it is preferable to print programs of meetings which would draw an attendance from a large area as live news in advance of the date rather than as dead news after the event. In this connection it should be remembered that the December issue, e.g., appears on November fifteenth, and that items must be in hand five or six weeks in advance of the latter date.]

Ohio Classical Conference

The twenty-first annual meeting of the Ohio Classical Conference will be held at Oxford and Hamilton, October 29-31.¹ The program for Friday morning, October 30, comprises: "Caesar versus Ersatz," by Margaret Wright, Wilbur Wright High School, Dayton; "The Classicist's Reading Program," by Edwin L. Findley, Fenn College; "Following a Bypath," by Howard H. Dowlin, University School, Cincinnati; "Late Classical and Mithraic Art," by LeRoy A. Campbell, Hiram College. In the afternoon the papers will be: "Metrical and Accentual Symmetry in Vergil," by Betty Helen Burt, Girard High School; "What are the Classics?" (illustrated), by Arthur M. Young, University of Akron; "The Classics and the New Poetry," by Jeremy Ingalls, Western College. Later in the afternoon teachers in secondary schools are invited to join in an informal discussion of "The Classics in Our High Schools in War Time," while at the same hour the college and university group will discuss "The Adjustment of College Latin Students in Their Freshman Year." At the annual dinner Joseph Remenyi, of Cleveland College, will deliver an address entitled, "The Importance of Literature in Grim Times."

¹ If gas rationing is in effect in Ohio before October 29, inquire of any Conference officer whether meetings will be held.

The program for Saturday morning will consist of: "General Language, the Basis of the Eighth-Grade English Course," by Mildred Fisher, Jackson High School; "Preparation for Teaching Latin Today," by Anita Strauch, Johnny Appleseed Junior High School, Mansfield; "The State Testing Program in Latin," by Grace Griffith, Lancaster High School.

Wisconsin—Beloit College

Beloit College sustained a very severe loss during the past summer in the death of Professor Floyd McGranahan, August 27, at the age of fifty-three. Though he had come to Beloit in 1925 as a teacher of English, death and retirement had shifted his energies, first to the teaching of Greek, and in 1939 to the teaching of Latin as well. In these courses he was unusually successful, especially in presenting Greek drama in English.

Floyd McGranahan was born in Indianola, Iowa, was graduated from Simpson College, took his M.A. degree at the University of Iowa, and additional graduate work at the University of Wisconsin and the University of Chicago. Combining, as he did, a deep love of English literature with his training in the classics, he became a forceful and popular teacher. Add to this a genial personality and more than usual ability as an amateur pianist, and you have, in part, the man. He will be sorely missed at Beloit.

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

[Compiled by Professors Adolph Frederick Pauli and John William Spaeth, Jr., of Wesleyan University.]

The Art Bulletin xxiv (1942).—(June: 155-159) Dorothy Kent Hill, "The Horse of Sardis Rediscovered." It is now in the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore. "I submit that the use of this horse's head as an attribute of a statue of a Dioscurus or of the two Dioscuri, who had or who had not the head from the wall at Sardis, is more probable than that it belonged to a chariot group—requiring, as this does, its position upon a body which it is not sculptured to suit, and the total destruction of the chariot, the body of one horse, and all of the other horse." There are seven illustrations.

Banta's Greek Exchange xxx (1942).—April: 125-127) Herman S. Sidener, "The Ancient Greek Temple." A brief description, with four photographic illustrations and one plan.

The Biblical Archaeologist iv (1941).—(December: 49-64) H. Harvard Arnason, "The History of the Chalice of Antioch." This article (to be continued) is a digest and criticism of the important books and articles dealing with the chalice, with the purpose of summarizing the results attained up to the present time. There are ten photographic illustrations.

The Bodleian Library Record ii (1942).—(February: 43-50) "The Art of War, an Exhibition." "The English writers on the art of war of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were largely dependent on late classical authorities." Several English versions of classical writers are cited with comments. The article is "to be concluded."

Books Abroad xvi (1942).—(Winter: 35 f.) "Foreign-Language Instruction in Latin America." A brief extract from a lecture by Henry Grattan Doyle. ". . . the Latin Americans . . . do in general a better job on foreign languages than we do." (Spring: 151 f.) Henry M. Wriston, "A Blind Spot in Education." This note comments on the schoolmen's unfavorable attitude toward the teaching of foreign languages. "It is safe to say that more Americans hear daily some foreign language than at any previous time in our history, including the World War."

Bulletin of The John Rylands Library xxvi (1942).—(May-June: 413-430)

[Henry Guppy], "The Dawn of the Revival of Learning." Consists of Part II: "The Discovery of the New World," and Part III: "A New System of Education." It is suggested that Columbus received inspiration from the classics to make his famous voyage in 1492. The changes in education were "based upon classical models" and involved the study of ancient culture.

The Burlington Magazine LXXX (1942).—(April: 81 f.) "Editorial: Art Treasures Lost and Found." The article deals mostly with a marble statue of Diomedes with the Palladium by Johan Tobias Sergel. There are two photographic illustrations. (90-93) Nikolaus Pevsner, "A Bronze Statuette by Peter Vischer the Elder." It is identified as "in all probability a *Neptune*." There are five photographic illustrations including one of "Hercules and Antaeus," also attributed to Peter Vischer the Elder.

The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science VIII (1942).—(May: 247-260) H. Michell, "Economic History of the Hellenistic World." This article is a long, favorable, summarizing review of M. Rostovtzeff's *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*.

College Art Journal I (1942).—(January: 25-28) Frederick R. Matson, "Technological Ceramic Studies." This note states the value of such studies for the archaeologist.

The Contemporary Review CLXI (1942).—(March: 171-176) Gerhard Schmidt, "The Foreigners." This inquiry into the tendency of states and peoples of the West, in the past, to express hatred of foreigners touches upon the attitude in the ancient Greek and Roman world.

E L H, A Journal of English Literary History IX (1942).—(June: 118-135) Francis Edwards Litz, "The Sources of Charles Gildon's *Complete Art of Poetry*." "In the Preface to the *Complete Art of Poetry* Charles Gildon declared that his intention was 'to remove the Ignorance of our Writers and Readers of Poesy . . . by giving our English World those Rules, by the Observation of which, Homer, Virgil, and the rest of the Antients gain'd immortal Reputation.'" The author is concerned with uncovering the immediate source of Gildon's text. ". . . it is difficult not to conclude that Gildon obviously tried to conceal the scissors-and-paste nature of the *Complete Art of Poetry*."

Ethics LII (1942).—(July: 395-433) G. Stanley Whitby, "Justice." ". . . I propose to attempt the construction of a theory of justice, using the *Republic* of Plato as a basis." The author seems primarily concerned with the notion that justice is "minding one's own business."

The Harvard Theological Review XXXV (1942).—(January: 1-11) Campbell

Bonner, "A Tarsian Peculiarity (Dio Prus., *Or.* 33) With an Unnoticed Fragment of Porphyry." Dio Chrysostom in this thirty-third, or first Tarsic, discourse rebuked the Tarsians for an impropriety which he calls *þéykeiv*. Professor Bonner cites evidence to show that there was "some conscious or unconscious association between the tabooed behavior and the pathology of the sexual act." According to a fragment of Porphyry a similar resounding noise through the nose was a "feature of Greek sacrificial procedure." (25-44) V. Tscherikower and F. M. Heichelheim, "Jewish Religious Influence in the Adler Papyri?" The first author concluded that "we are not entitled to speak about 'the influence of Judaism in Egypt as shown in these and other texts.'" The other is convinced of Jewish influence in the Adler Archive. (April: 87-93) Campbell Bonner, "Aeolus Figured on Colic Amulets." Aeolus is identified as the demon of colic, and the eagle as the counter-charm. Of the two photographic illustrations one shows an amulet, made of haematite, in the Museum of Classical Archaeology at the University of Michigan. (131-169) Harry Austryn Wolfson, "Philo on Free Will." "Philo has modified, or perhaps he thought that he only interpreted, Plato's conception of the unalterability of the laws of nature in accordance with his belief in the miraculous intervention of God in the established order of the universe . . . it is quite evident that by man's free will Philo means an absolutely undetermined freedom like that enjoyed by God, who by His power to work miracles can upset the laws of nature and the laws of causality which He himself has established. . . . The cumulative impression of all these statements then is that, while a man is able to choose the better, he will not have to rely upon his own power, that is to say, that power of free will with which God has endowed all men, for, if he proves himself worthy, God, through His thoughtfulness, will aid him in making that choice by bringing him to Himself. . . . It is this traditional conception of God's, as well as man's, freedom of the will, which originated in the philosophy of Philo and was maintained throughout mediaeval philosophy, though occasionally somewhat modified, that was made the subject of attack by those who before Spinoza began to nibble at traditional philosophy, and by Spinoza himself in his grand assault on it." Deviations from Plato are stressed.

The Hibbert Journal XL (1942).—(April: 264-273) John Murphy, "How We Are Limited by Language in Philosophy and Theology." There are "two restrictions in particular, namely, first that in its early stages the civilised mind is near and akin to the primitive, and passes little beyond its solutions for life's problems; and, second, that under various influences from the pressure of outside circumstances, or from its own weariness of the effort of thought and of exacting moral judgments, the higher type of mind may slip downwards and fall back upon childlike or barbarous ways of thinking, and may take refuge in words, language, and doctrines appropriate to these simpler ways." There are references to Greek philosophy. (July: 374-380) G. Stephens Spinks "A Light in the Dark Ages—and Beyond." An essay about Boethius. In him

"we catch sight of a man who had known all the greatness of office, the delights of knowledge, and who then experiences the worst personal disasters in a period, the worst in the recorded history of the Western world, and yet through it all, without bitterness and with a final equanimity kept alive not only the treasures of human learning, but the courage of the human heart recording in his last book his last conviction about the spiritual life."

Isis XXXIII (1942).—(March: 557-574) George Sarton, "Brave Busbecq (1522-1592)." This distinguished ambassador for the German empire at the Turkish court collected ancient coins, inscriptions, and manuscripts. He discovered and had copied the *Monumentum Ancyranum*; he acquired "whole wagonfuls, whole shiploads, of Greek manuscripts," now in the library of Vienna. Among the manuscripts he found is the important *Codex Aniciae Julianae* of Dioscorides. Four illustrations of plants in this codex are reproduced photographically. (575-578) O. Neugebauer, "The Chronology of the Aramaic Papyri from Elephantine." The author aims to show the error of the chronology proposed by A. Kenney-Herbert in 1938. (578-602) Rudolf von Erhardt and Erika von Erhardt-Siebold, "Archimedes' Sand-Reckoner: Aristarchos and Copernicus." "The present study analyzes the famous heliocentric passage in the *Sand-Reckoner* ($\psi \alpha \mu \iota \tau \eta \varsigma$), a short treatise attributed to the great Archimedes of Syracuse (ca. 287-212 B.C.). This passage has been regarded the principal and most reliable testimony for the promulgation by Aristarchos of Samos (ca. 310-230 B.C.) of a genuine heliocentric astronomy. . . . Finally, attention is drawn to the almost certain acquaintance of Copernicus with the *Sand-Reckoner*." (624) Helene Weiss, "Notes on the Greek Ideas Referred to in van Helmont: *De Tempore*." These brief notes follow an article by Walter Pagel on "John Baptist van Helmont: *De Tempore* and the History of the Biological Concept of Time." (June: 649-653) Lynn Thorndike, "Translations of Works of Galen from the Greek by Peter of Abano." Translations of fourteen items are identified. (689 f.) Arthur Stanley Pease, "Fossil Fishes Again." In this note evidence is cited which "seems to rank Xenophanes as perhaps the earliest known palaeontologist." (691-712) Dana B. Durand, "Magic and Experimental Science: the Achievement of Lynn Thorndike." This is a survey and appraisal of Professor Thorndike's *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, especially of the fifth and sixth volumes. The ancient period is treated in the first volume.

Journal of Calendar Reform XII (1942).—(January-February-March: 11-16) Elisabeth Achelis, "A Perpetual Calendar." A promotional article which has at the beginning "a brief review of early calendar history."

Journal of Near Eastern Studies I (1942).—(July: 315-340) Edgar J. Goodspeed, "The Possible Aramaic Gospel." Written in reply to Olmstead's article which appeared in the January number (Cf. *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* XXXVII, 560). "The new argument for the [written] Aramaic gospel, in short, leaves me

more assured than before that the whole supposed Aramaic gospel movement has been conjured up in a literary vacuum, and the chief difficulty in attacking it is that there is really nothing to attack. . . . I quite agree that there was an Aramaic gospel, and that it was the earliest of gospels. But it was an oral, not a written gospel, and that is what Papias was trying to convey in his somewhat baffling remarks on the subject, preserved in Eusebius, *Church History* III, 39, 15." Important for classicists is the survey of Greek literature produced between A.D. 20 and 80. "It reveals a highly developed, alert, sensitive, appreciative Greek civilization, very active in the fields of science, medicine, rhetoric, education, theology, and religion—an ideal soil, broad, tolerant, and inquiring, for the literary expression of the new Christian faith."

The Journal of Religion xxII (1942).—(April: 187-204) B. Le Roy Burkhart, "The Rise of the Christian Priesthood." "The Christian priesthood appeared simultaneously in Rome and in North Africa *circa* A.D. 200." One section of the article deals with "the process of spiritualizing worship in the pagan world."

The Journal of Theological Studies XLIII (1942).—(January-April: 1-11) H. J. Carpenter, "Symbolum as a Title of the Creed." The author surveys the significance of the Latin word in Christian and non-Christian writers. "The legal significance of a 'bond' or 'warrant or token of an agreement' is ancient and persists for centuries in the minds of Christian writers on the creed, as does also less prominently that of a seal, which is equally ancient. . . . Now we have already seen that a chain of later Christian writers connect *symbolum* with a pact made between God and man in baptism, and this is a meaning which accords with the earlier usage of *symbolum* (and indeed of *τὸ σύμβολον*) in secular contexts. . . . The main point of interest which follows from the argument of this article is the elimination of the password idea from the connotation of *symbolum* as originally applied to the creed." (19-25) C. C. Tarelli, "Some Further Linguistic Aspects of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels." "The general conclusion from all these instances seems to be that the text probably did, from a very early date, suffer both from 'improvements' and from the careless obliteration of fine shades of expression, and that it is not by any means a safe rule to reject, as a matter of course, the most correct or elegant of two or more readings." This papyrus also does not confirm the "peculiar habitual purity" of B in word order as concerns the Gospels. (25-30) G. Zuntz, "The Byzantine Text in New Testament Criticism." This article advocates the reconstruction of the Byzantine text as "a necessary preliminary to the production of a thesaurus exhibiting, within surveyable limits, the whole material for the criticism of the New Testament." Procedure in forming this thesaurus is discussed. (30-34) G. D. Kilpatrick, "The Oxford Greek New Testament." This critique surveys "unsatisfactory features" found in the two parts already published. (45-59) P. Prime, "Tenuissima forma cognitionis:

Predication in St. Augustine's Theory of Knowledge." ". . . in St. Augustine the mind is held to be dependent upon sensation only in immediate judgments upon sensation, and all the principles of knowledge and the transcendentals which are the subject-matter of metaphysics are seen by the mind *per seipsum*. . . . He is attacking the Stoics, the Epicureans, the New Academy, by showing that the essence of the problem of knowledge is not touched by objections against the value of sense-knowledge, for knowledge is not, in its essence, dependent on sensible experience. . . . whereas Plato's reminiscence had reference to a past existence, the mind awaking to the recognition of the Ideal which it previously knew, in St. Augustine the Ideal is something present: it appears to the mind together with that in which it is reflected, to which it gives intelligibility, just as the light is seen in its effect of illuminating the object of vision. If also the Ideal is said to be remembered, that is because the remembering of intellectual objects is an act of renewed intellectual apprehension. . . . The Ideas, and God Himself, are only partially apprehended, and under a multiplicity of names, whereas they are one." (83-92) T. W. Manson, "[Review of] *Nouum Testamentum Graece sec. Textum Westcott-Hortianum: Euangelicum sec. Matthaeum* . . . Edidit S. C. E. Legg." A long, unfavorable review. Valuable suggestions are made regarding "the problem of the New Testament text as a whole and the framing of a long-term policy to deal with it." (102-106) M. P. Charlesworth, "[Review of] *Christianity and Classical Culture* . . . by Charles Norris Cochrane. 1940." This gives a lengthy survey and very favorable evaluation of the book.

Life XIII (1942).—(August 3: 57-65) "Maps: Global War Teaches Global Cartography." This *Photographic Essay* indicates "some of the landmarks of cartography and the three major map projections that are essential to planning and comprehension of a global war." It begins with a review of the contributions of the Greeks. The essay is well-illustrated.

PAULI

Modern Language Review XXXVII (1942).—(April: 169-184) R. M. Dawkins, "Modern Greek Oral Versions of Apollonios of Tyre." The object of this paper "is to describe the versions of the story recorded in recent years from Greek oral tradition, and their relation to a very fine example, not yet published, collected some years ago at the village of Asphendioú in the island of Kos. All these versions . . . are derived from a rhymed version printed several times at Venice, first in the year 1534."

Modern Philology XXXIX (1942).—(May: 337-360) Bernard Weinberg, "Scaliger versus Aristotle on Poetics." Searching explanation of the reasons for J. C. Scaliger's differences with Aristotle's *Poetics* on certain fundamental points of theory, particularly on the definition of tragedy, the qualitative parts of tragedy, the end of poetry, and the relative importance of plot and character.

More Books (Bulletin of the Boston Public Library) xvii (1942).—(May: 183-212) Zoltán Haraszti, "The Ship of Fools and Other Early Books." Description of sixteen incunabula recently acquired by the Boston Public Library. Two illustrations.

Musical Quarterly xxviii (1942).—(April: 190-204) Oliver Strunk, "The Tonal System of Byzantine Music."

Bulletin of the New York Public Library xlvi (1942).—(January: 3-102) Ida A. Pratt, "Ancient Egypt: 1925-1941, Part II." A detailed bibliography, supplementing *Ancient Egypt: A List of References to Material in the New York Public Library* (1925).

The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America xxxvi (1942).—(First Quarter: 18-26) Curt F. Bühler, "Notes on Two Incunabula Printed by Aldus Manutius." *Brevissima Introductio ad Litteras Graecas*, prefixed by Aldus to his edition of the Greek *Horae ad Usum Romanum* (1497), is with the exception of its last item, "no more than a very condensed reissue of the 'Introduction to Greek' which Aldus added to the end of the first Greek book produced by his press, the *Erotemata* of Constantinus Lascaris." There were two issues of the Greek *Horae* in 1497.

Philological Quarterly xxi (1942).—(April: 244-247) Grace H. Macurdy, "Sophoclean Irony in *Oedipus Tyrannus* 219-221." An interpretation of the passage.

PMLA (Publications of the Modern Language Association of America) lvii (1942).—(March: 74-88) Elizabeth M. Nugent, "Sources of John Rastell's *The Nature of the Four Elements*." Some late Latin sources. (June: 327-342) Antonio L. Mezzacappa, "The Preposition *A* <*AB* and its Use in *La Divina Commedia*." This study attempts to disprove the prevalent theory that the Latin preposition *ab* disappeared completely from the Italian vernacular by the eighth century and to show that, "far from disappearing in Italy, [it] remained very active in its descendant *a* Its use . . . was quite common up to the end of the Renaissance." Extensive evidence is presented for the various functions of Italian *a* <*ab* (not <*ad*) in the *Divine Comedy*. (343-353) E. Bagby Atwood, "The Judgment of Paris in the *Seige of Troye*." An investigation of sources for this episode in the Middle English poem *Seige of Troye*. (404-420) Sara R. Watson, "Milton's Ideal Day: Its Development as a Pastoral Theme." The purpose of this study is "to demonstrate that the description of the ideal day is a significant and deeply rooted theme which developed gradually during the whole course of the pastoral tradition. . . . that Milton's *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso* are concerned with an ancient and well established pastoral theme, that their personal and melancholy elements are rooted in the tradition of pastoralism, and that their form or organization first received full expression by Virgil."

Romanic Review XXXIII (1942).—(April: 157-163) Louis H. Gray, "Six Romance Etymologies."

School and Society LV (1942).—(April 11: 406-410) Carl Grant, "Foreign-Language Study as Functional: A Reply to Dr. Sisson." In replying to E. O. Sisson's article, "Foreign-Language Teaching as an Educational Problem" (printed in the November 1, 1941, number), the author states that "the main thesis of this paper is that foreign-language study is indispensable to the educational curriculum of an age which, imperiled by a barbarian invasion of gigantic proportions, needs for its survival every intellectual tool, every resource of the mind, every approach to its problems that the human race has ever devised." (April 18: 448-450) A. M. Withers, "Upon What Meat Doth English Feed?" Another adverse comment on Professor Sisson's article: the latter's "emphatic denial . . . of essentiality for distinction in English of the study of some foreign languages appears to me quite insecurely based, and as probably due to the lack of certain types of experience. . . . Dr. Sisson would find, I am convinced, that all the highest-ranking men and women in the English-teaching profession proclaim the essentiality of Latin for the best in English, not as a theory, but as a self-evident truth. . . ."

Studies in Philology XXXIX (1942).—(April: 143-159) D. T. Starnes, "E. K.'s Classical Allusions Reconsidered." The conclusion of this investigation is that many of E. K.'s (=Edward Kirke's?) classical allusions in his glosses of Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar* "are based not upon original classical writings but upon secondary sources found in standard reference books of his own day. . . . Since E. K. drew freely from contemporary dictionaries, is it not logical to suppose that Spenser, also, and other contemporary authors employed similar sources as a means of verification, or of refreshing their memories, or occasionally of first-hand inspiration?" (437-440) Don C. Allen, "Recent Literature of the Renaissance: Neo-Latin." A bibliography.

Times Literary Supplement (London) XLI (1942).—(March 7, No. 2092, 115) "A Classic for To-Day." An editorial praising F. M. Cornford's recently published translation of Plato's *Republic* and extolling the eternal importance of the *Republic*, which "should obviously be read by all politicians and constitution-makers; by all educationists and journalists; by every one in fact who prides himself on being in any way in the vanguard of thought or affairs." (March 28, No. 2095, 148) C. W. B., "Salute to Hellas." The Greek text and a verse translation of Simonides' epitaph upon the Athenians who fell at Plataea (*Anth. Pal.* vii, 253).

Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes IV (1940-41).—(October, 1940-January, 1941: 1-18) Rudolph Wittkower, "Alberti's Approach to Antiquity in Architecture." Explanation of inconsistencies in Leon Batista Alberti's *Ten Books on Architecture*. "In the relatively short period of twenty

years Alberti passed through the whole range of approaches to classical architecture which was possible in the Renaissance. He developed from an emotional to an archeological outlook. Next he subordinated classical authority to the logic of the wall structure. And finally he repudiated archeology and objectivity and used classical architecture as a storehouse which supplied him with the motives for a free and subjective planning of wall architecture. Alberti is the only architect who progresses through all these stages, which follow one another as a logical evolution." Illustrated. (19-46) F. Saxl, "The Classical Inscription in Renaissance Art and Politics: Bartholomaeus Fontius, *Liber monumentorum Romanae urbis et aliorum locorum*." A discussion of some aspects of the interest in epigraphical studies among Renaissance scholars, with particular attention to a fragmentary manuscript, now in the possession of Professor Bernard Ashmole of London. This manuscript, the work of the Italian scholar Bartolomaeus Fontius (1445-1513), contains a large number of classical inscriptions, many of them not found in the *CIL* or the *CIG*. The article concludes with a description of the manuscript and a catalogue of its contents. Illustrated. (47-66) Phyllis L. Williams, "Two Roman Reliefs in Renaissance Disguise." A discussion of two Roman funerary monuments, included among the antiquities published in 1534 by Petrus Apianus in his *Inscriptiones Sacrosanctae Vetusatis*, "which graphically illustrate the transformations and misinterpretations suffered by ancient works at the hands of those well-intentioned enthusiasts who promoted the Classical Revival in Germany." Illustrated. (103-113) Wolfgang Stechow, "The Myth of Philemon and Baucis in Art." The representations in art of this Ovidian myth are comparatively scarce and incoherent. "The rendering of the transformation of the old couple into trees was entirely restricted to book illustration and never displayed anything of particular interest. . . . It is the meal of the gods, the hospitality of Philemon and Baucis and their willingness to sacrifice their last goose to the gods, that attracted the attention of the artists." Illustrated.

Yale Review xxxi (1942).—(Summer: 713-729) M. Rostovtzeff, "How Archaeology Aids History." A summary of the results of recent archaeological researches in the Near East, Greece, and Italy, with some particular attention to the excavations at Dura-Europos on the Euphrates.

SPAETH